

AMERICAN CHURCH REVIEW.

VOL. XXXII.—MARCH AND APRIL, 1880.

RITUAL LAW IN THE AMERICAN CHURCH.

The importance of correct views of Ritual Law arises from the high place which the Ritual holds in the expression of the public worship of the Church, and as her most efficient means of preserving and presenting the vital truths which She is called to teach.

The popular tendency of the present time is to regard the sermon as the chief matter in the public service of the Church. Where this is the feeling it can be of little moment just what are the details of the acts of devotion by which the sermon is accompanied. There must be a certain measure of prayer and praise, and the minister must perform these services with propriety, and reverence; but beyond this it cannot be of serious concern precisely what these "exercises" are, nor how the minister conducts them.

But such has never been the view which the Church Catholic, in any of its branches, has taken of the meaning and value of the public worship of the Church.

¹ Erratum. The January-February number is printed as Vol. XXXIII. It ought to be XXXII.

From the very first, "All that believed were together," and "continued steadfastly in the doctrine and fellowship of the Apostles, and in the breaking of THE Bread, and in THE Prayers." They came together not only to hear the preaching of the Apostles, but also to worship in the "Common Prayers" of the brethren, to enjoy the holy fellowship with the living body of Christ's people, and, in the breaking of THE Bread as He commanded, to hold Sacramental Communion with their risen Lord, and "to show forth His death till He come."

The elements thus embodied in this early worship of the Church were soon incorporated into fixed and authoritative Liturgies, and have ever since been regarded as the essential features of the public worship of the congregation.

Since the Church "in the United States" is a true branch of "the One Catholic and Apostolic Church," our Liturgy must be considered as based upon essentially the same principles as all the other forms of the Church's Liturgy; and we can gain a correct view of the nature and construction of our Ritual Law only by a clear understanding of the opinions which every branch of the *Catholic* Church has always held in reference to the authority and import of its own appointed Ritual. For the essential objects which constrained the Church from the beginning to ordain authoritative Liturgies were the same in all, and these were both to secure attention to the thoughts which should enter into the constant worship of the Church, and because the use of fixed and obligatory forms was the most efficient, and only certain means of preserving her spiritual truths unchanged, and supplying the continual influences which were necessary for the spiritual growth and welfare of her members.

Hence from the time when the Liturgies were given to the Church by the Apostles, or the Apostolic men who learned of them, they were accepted as the Church's authoritative utterance of the truths she meant to teach, and as the precise mode and form in which she thought it best to have these truths presented.

With this view her children came together in these appointed forms and words that they might there receive from HER and share with HER the feast of holy things SHE had prepared for them. They came to offer in her words the Common Prayer she gave them all to pray: to join in loving songs of praise which she had taught, or made: to hear the lesson of HER choosing from the written Word of God. And as the heart and centre of the whole, to gather around the "Holy table" of her risen Lord, "and continue the perpetual memory of that, his precious death and sacrifice, until his coming again:" to receive the Holy Gifts according to his Holy Institution, that they "may be partakers of his most blessed Body and Blood:" feeding their souls with his spiritual food, and "offering themselves their souls and bodies to be a reasonable, holy and living sacrifice unto him."

The entire Ritual portion of the service was thus the expression of the mind and purpose of the CHURCH, not of the individual minister; and as such, it was "set forth and established" in fixed words and appointed acts "which no one might presume to alter except he be lawfully called and authorized thereunto."¹

This was considered especially important in regard to the Sacramental office of the Church. It is to that, indeed, that the term Liturgy is properly applied. This was emphatically the divine service of the Church; it was through the appointed words and acts of the Liturgic service that the Church conveyed her highest blessings, and she always considered it as an authoritative utterance of her vital truths. Hence this was never regarded as in any sense the property of the officiating Priest.

There was a time and place in the public service in which the living teacher might give his word (*sermon*) of exhortation, or instruction, but it was not by any alterations in the forms or language of the Liturgy that he should do it.

¹ Preface to the English Prayer Book.

The very significance of this service as the especial organ of the Church's teaching required that she should provide against the intrusion of all individual opinions, and all modes of distorting it by any personal ideas. Hence she was not content to leave any uncertainty in the performance of this Ritual; but as it was felt to be the chiefest safeguard of the faith, she ordered with scrupulous care every word the minister should use, and every symbolic act he was to do in the administering of this high and holy office.

In this the Church, and the Church alone, was the actor, and the teacher, and the giver: while the "Priest at the Altar" was there solely as *HER* mouth-piece and *HER* agent. She gives him the words to say, and when to use them: she commands him to continue the memorial of the Lord's death; and directs him how to do this "according to *HIS* holy Institution;" she ordains that he "call the people that they will be partakers of this Holy Communion;" and appoints how he shall deliver it to those who are there to receive.

His office in this Liturgic service is to say the words the Church has given him, no less, no more, no other; to perform the acts she bids him, and only these. To add others which she had not ordered would be to change her presentation of the truth by symbols of his own: to omit what she thought needful to convey her mind, would be to mutilate the form in which she had expressed her teaching.

In other words, the *Church* and not the *individual Priest* is the SOURCE of the Ritual: his only right to minister at her Altar is by her commission; and when he is officiating in her Liturgy, the only words or symbolic acts he is at liberty to use, are those she has commanded.

It is just this principle which has always given such high importance to the Rituals of the service. In them we "hear the Church," not any one minister or man. By this symbolic act, we learn how the Church (not the officiating Priest,) intends that her doctrine should be represented.

This principle of the relation of the Ritual to the Church

lies at the foundation of every true and Catholic conception of the office of the minister in the performance of the Liturgy. If every, or any individual Priest could of his own will omit, change, or add to any part of this authoritative expression of the Church's thought, there could no longer be any definite Church teaching, or Church worship. Nor would it matter whether the changes were made in the words, or in the symbolic acts by which these were accompanied. By the one the Church speaks to the ear : and by the other to the eye : and neither in the one nor in the other has she ever allowed her officiating ministers to intrude their personal conceptions by supplying any other symbolic actions than those she has ordained : or using any other words than those she bids him utter.

There was indeed a power inherent from the first, in the Episcopate to exercise a certain control over the details of the Ritual in their several Dioceses, and under this authority the Bishop would occasionally introduce some change in either the words or form of the Liturgic service.

Sometimes a General or Provincial Council, as the aggregate of the Episcopate, would ordain certain rules of wider application than a single Diocese ; but these powers, although conceded to exist in the Episcopal office, were exercised but rarely, and in comparatively minor matters, so long as the Church retained the Apostolic traditions and Catholic unity unimpaired. And so strong and universal was the conviction that the Ritual was the Church's service, that the assumption by any individual Priest of a right to introduce forms, or observances not adopted by the *Church* in her unbroken¹ usage, or explicit orders, would have been

¹ "Unbroken usage" or an "usage which has not been doubted or questioned" from "the earliest periods of the Church," constitutes the Common Law of the Church, and is "recognized as a distinct source of Ecclesiastical Jurisprudence ;" but this as a necessary condition of its application demands that the usage in question shall have been continuous, and continuously accepted as an usage of the Church. It cannot be employed to bring in usages which have for centuries been unknown and in that period were not

regarded everywhere as opposed to the whole Catholic conception of the nature, intention and value of the Liturgy.

That such is the view of the Ritual which has always been held and enforced by the Church Catholic both in its primitive unity and in all its branches is so universally accepted by all who know anything of Liturgic History, that it cannot be necessary to adduce especial authorities to sustain it.¹ It has from the beginning been always assumed as an admitted first principle to be reasoned from, rather than a matter of question to be decided by discussion. Hence if we desire to understand the import and scope of the Ritual Law of the Church, as this has always been regarded in the principles and legislation of the Church Catholic, we must start from these historic facts as our fundamental idea, and must construe the obligations of the officiating minister in accordance with this conception.

employed in the performance of the services. Sir Robert Phillimore admits the existence of this Common Law, and limits it in its application as above stated. He asks "is there a Common Law living by usage though partially expressed by Judicial decisions, or still more taken for granted by all the authorities in Church and State?" He replies unequivocally "there is such an usage, and the Western Church recognizes it as a source of Ecclesiastical Jurisprudence." And he adds "the existence of this *lex non scripta* is generally ascertained by adjudicated cases, but it may be proved by public notoriety, etc." *Ecclesiastical Cases*, p. 72.

¹ I will refer to only two, and these not because I think them needed to support the opinions above stated, but for the reason that they express the facts so clearly and tersely as to cover all the points necessary to be borne in mind. Van Espin quoted by Stephens on the Prayer Book, Vol. I., 141, says "*Singularum Ecclesiarum ritus atque ceremonias, sive ritualia servanda sunt neque presbyteriis alliisve ecclesie ministris ritum prescriptum immutare licet, eo etiam pretextu quod contrarius ritus pristinae ecclesie discipline conformior esset. Videreturque ad excitandum populi devotionem nec non ad explicanda mysteria aptior et convenientior.*" It would be difficult to find language that more utterly excludes grounds for an individual to add anything to or take anything from the Ritual as definitely commanded.

Sir Robert Phillimore after quoting and approving other authorities to this same effect sums up the whole position, (*Eccles. Cases*, p. 72), "the Canon Law *unquestionably* places in the hands of the Bishop the authority to GOVERN all questions of Ritual." These only express what the true Catholic doctrine of Ritual must always assert.

Such being the uniform and unquestionable teaching of the Church on the relation of the Priest to the Ritual, it is obvious that the very recent assumption of some in the American Church that "the individual minister" has "entire liberty of Ritual to introduce anything he please, provided it have not been EXPLICITLY FORBIDDEN," is wholly in contradiction to every true and Catholic conception of the nature and import of the Liturgy.

The first appearance of a claim for the independence of the minister in the forms of worship, as an actual factor in discussions about the Ritual came from the self-will and lawless individualism of the Puritans. It never could have been maintained in any age where the relation of the Liturgy to the general order of the Church was rightly apprehended. It is essentially and thoroughly a Puritan idea; and whatever may be the interest in which it has been for the time evoked, it is, in fact, only the manifestation in another direction of that same spirit of revolt against the Church's order which was one of the most dangerous and disorganizing elements of the old Puritanic leaven. The things which they desired to do may have been different, but the spirit of personal assertion in the performance of the Church's service, is equally unchurchly and uncatholic in both; and if it ever be conceded to the ministers as a right, not only will it introduce a new and foreign element into the Law of Ritual, but it will soon and utterly, destroy all definite and authoritative doctrine in the Church's Liturgy.

But further, this claim that the officiating minister has "an inherent, or granted liberty to do anything in the Ritual that is not expressly 'forbidden' in the Rubrics" rests on a mistaken notion of the structure of the Ritual Law, and the relation of the Rubrics to the duty of the minister.

Those who maintain their right to do anything in the service which is not prohibited in the actual words of the Rubrics, lay great stress on a discrimination they make between three classes of things which may be affected by

the Law of Ritual: 1. "Things that are expressly allowed or required to be done by our American Legislation, these must be done." 2. "Things expressly forbidden by that Legislation, these must be left undone." 3. "Things neither ordered nor prohibited expressly;—in regard to these there is entire liberty to do them if the Priest at the Altar think it best to do them."

There are indeed these three classes of things, and they embrace all the possible relations of things to the Ritual. Some are commanded; some are prohibited; some are not mentioned at all. It certainly takes no remarkable acumen to recognize the truth of this division; and as certainly it would not have occupied much space in the discussions about Ritual Law, had it not been applied in support of the enormous assumption of "entire Ritual liberty in reference to the innumerable things under class three which are neither ordered nor prohibited."

And the ground on which it is so employed is a conception of the relation of the officiating minister to the Ritual which is essentially false and misleading. The minister is tacitly but confidently assumed to have some natural and personal right to perform the service of the Church as he may deem the best, "except" in matters where the Rubrics, by special prohibition, have abridged his proper and inherent liberty of Ritual action; that to this end the Church has definitely pointed out and mentioned not only *all* the things which he must do, but also *all* the things he must not do. Hence that he has a recognized authority to go outside of what she has commanded, and do anything and all he please as master of the service in all things which are not in terms forbidden him. That is, he regards the Ritual as a restraint upon his personal liberty, and not in its true character, as the sole authority he has for everything he is to do in the performance of the services. But when we come to study the bearing of the Rubrics on the performance of the Liturgy it is very apparent that our Ritual was formed on no such theory. It is not an elaborate

apparatus for the limitation of the personal liberty of the Priest by careful prohibition of the things he must not do. It virtually recognizes but one relation of the minister to the Ritual he has to perform; and that is, of an agent whom she commands just what to do and all that he has a right before her altar officially to do; he is there, not only to do all that she has bidden him, but to do no Ritual act except what she has ordered him. That this is certainly the principle of the structure of the Ritual is shown by the fact, that the whole tenor of the Rubrics of our Liturgy is mandatory and not discriminative between things that must be done, and other things it is prohibited to do. There is just one Rubric in the American Liturgy which forbids anything whatever; and this is: "If any of the consecrated Bread and Wine remain after the Communion it shall not be carried out of the Church;" hence if the Priest take care that no portion of the Sacrament be "reserved" and "carried out" of the Church, but is all eaten and drunk as directed, within, there is no other act (if this notion of Ritual liberty be true) which the Church does not give him permission¹ to introduce, and does not intend that he shall have the right to use. The entire class of things he is in terms forbid to do, in the communion office, consists of just one act to be avoided;

¹ It may be said that there is an implied limitation of things that are thus permitted to usages which had been admitted by the Catholic Church in former times. But no one has ever pointed out any such limitation if the principle be allowed at all: and even if it be so limited, what portion of the earlier Church shall be the norm of our additions? The Sarum? Why that more than Hereford, or Bangor? The Roman Ordo? But that was not employed nor allowed to be employed in the authorized services of the Church of England. Shall it be the Primitive Church? What age of this—what portion of it? Once grant the principle and there is not, there cannot be any limitation of its use. And the very Catholic Theology, in whose interest this liberty is now claimed by so many earnest and devoted men, claimed I must believe in a mistaken idea of the relations of the Clergy to the Ritual, this very Catholic Theology would be the doctrine to suffer the most fatally by the destruction of the Church's time-sanctioned barriers against the personal intrusion of individual conceptions into the Ritual of the Liturgy.

and we are expected to believe that this one prohibition embraces all the conceivable acts or symbols of doctrine which the Church Ritual meant to be excluded from her Liturgic worship. We would have hardly ventured to impute so startling a conclusion to any theory of Ritual which could be adopted by any Churchman, had it not been deliberately announced, and maintained by many as the essential principle by which the conduct of the minister in performing the Ritual of the American Church is to be decided. As a clear and emphatic expression of this view, I quote from a very clever and plausible article in support of it, from "The Church and the World, New York, October, 1874, pp. 384, 389." After defining the three classes of things which we have referred to above, the author sums up the position of the minister in relation to "the almost innumerable points on which our American Church Legislation has said nothing," and says:

"Now the old and original principle of American Churchmen is that where there is no law there is no transgression....there ought to be no question at all in regard to a truth so simple and self-evident as this....This entire liberty¹ of Ritual is one of the most strikingly distinctive features of our American Church; it is peculiarly in harmony with the characteristics of this American people....It was deliberately adopted at the organization of the American Church after the Revolutionary war."

I will inquire, further on, how far the history of the American Prayer Book justifies the claim that the American Church has adopted this "strikingly distinctive feature"

¹ That the conclusions drawn from this assertion have not been overstated in the text will be evident from another passage in the same article, p. 391: "The law of liberty of Ritual is the law of this Church, which every Bishop, Priest and Deacon, of the same has bound himself to obey, observe, and follow; and every Bishop, Presbyter or other who attempts to interfere with or restrict that liberty of Ritual is a breaker of the law." "Some are scandalized at the sight of this immense amount of freedom, and assume that there must be some limits to it which are not expressed in American Legislation." The only assumption needed is that the laws of the American Church shall be continued upon the principles which have been accepted and acted on in every age and portion of the Church, and which were the undoubted principles on which our Ritual was framed.

into our Ritual Law. The only point at present before us is the consideration of the fact that such a conception of the structure of the Rubrical system of the Liturgy is wholly averse from every Catholic interpretation of the duties of the officiating minister ; and, if it were accepted, would permit, nay sanction, that very intrusion of individual opinions into the Liturgic Service of the Church which we have seen it was the uniform and universal intention of the Church Catholic to prevent. Under this view of Ritual liberty, the acting Priest might add one symbol to-day, and introduce another symbol with another phase of doctrine at the next communion. One minister might make the Church, by his peculiar interpolations of new actions, seem to teach one opinion ; another could make it inculcate, by his performances, a wholly opposite conception. Nor could this liberty, if once conceded, be restricted to any given line of doctrinal, or ecclesiastical expression. It might at the first be used only to bring in what a considerable portion of the Church would consider clearer views of Catholic Theology ; and the additions and interpolations or accompaniments might have all been sought in the Rituals of the earlier and more devotional periods of the Church. But if it be a liberty which belongs to all, who would not fear that in these changing times many would use this power to make the Church's Liturgy convey opinions which the pure Church would utterly abhor ?

There has been from the beginning, and there still remains, adequate provision in the Church to make such changes in the words or forms of the Liturgic Ritual as actual need, or thoughtful consideration shall require. New Rubrics may be made, old Rubrics may be modified, by proper legislative action. The Bishop's "Godly Admonition" is still the living authority in matters of doubtful construction, or the uncertain meaning of a Ritual Law. But these do not confer upon the ministering Priest any other liberty of Ritual than to do as he had promised before his ordination, viz : "Always so to minister the doctrine, and sacraments of

Christ as the Lord hath commanded, and *THIS* Church [the Church to whose worship he solemnly engages to conform] hath received the same." He did not bind himself, nor did he receive permission to minister these vital elements of the Church as the Greek Church, or the Roman, or the Nestorian hath received them; nor as his own ideas of Catholic Theology and usage would like to make them; but as "*THIS*," the American branch of the Church Catholic (using her authority as every branch of the Church Catholic has always done), as *THIS* Church whose agent and voice he is, as *THIS* Church which gave him alike his right to minister and the Ritual he was always to use, as *THIS Church hath received the same*. And he is at her altar to do and say just what her Ritual, and unquestioned Common Law have bid him to do, "Neither (as the old English Canon¹ has it) diminishing in any respect nor adding anything in the matter or form thereof."

The plea has been made urgently and with great force against any interference with these individual aberrations from the appointed order of our Liturgy, upon the ground of the danger from hasty Legislation in the Ritual of the Church, and it has been very truly said: "The science of Rites is one of the noblest of all departments of Theology."² I would go still further and say, that a proper use of Rites is simply vital to the perpetuity of the teaching office of the Church, and the moment that her Rites can be made subject to the whim or opinion of the officiating Priest, she ceases to have any authoritative organ for the presentation of her mind as the *ecclesia docens*, and is degraded to a mere aggregation of individual ministers, each moulding her offices according to his special fancy, and each employing such Rites as would express his own interpretation of her doctrine. I feel

¹Canons of 1603. Canon XIV.

²Sermon in Trinity Church, New York, on Ascension Day, 1874, by Morgan Dix, S. T. D., Rector, pp. 8, 5, 7.

most profoundly with the same writer, that "to legislate concerning the worship of Almighty God would indeed be a great thing to undertake." "Such legislation must be committed to men of calmness, intelligence and capacity." Nor do "I see anywhere any indication of the ability or the disposition to do the thing as it ought to be done if done at all."²

I, for one, recognize to the full the vital importance of a due preparation before any essential changes shall be legislated into our Ritual. I hail with unfeigned delight the revival through the Church of a reverence for true Catholic Theology, and a desire to reproduce some of the exquisite features of the grand old Liturgies of the earlier days of the undivided Church. I would beg our young men to live much in the study and the spirit of these precious monuments. And I would urge our "Masters of Sentences" to make the minds of the people familiar with their words and meaning. But all the more because it is so vitally important that no change should be admitted into the Church's highest office without the most careful scrutiny and sanction of the Church itself; all the more because to provide wisely for "the worship of Almighty God is a great thing to undertake." I would not have the individual minister allowed to perform this great work in his own portion of the Church; nor to assume and exercise the actual authority of this momentous legislation by bringing in a lot of unordained accompaniments on his own notion of the Ritual, or using uncommanded symbols in his performance of the Liturgy, and thus absolutely taking on himself the high office of altering the Church's Ritual, and possibly of misrepresenting some of the vital doctrines of the Church's Liturgy. If it be vastly important that the Church should not change the Ritual hastily, it is certainly quite as important, that the individual minister, often crude, ignorant, impulsive, or mistaken, as he might be, should know he has

² See preceding page.

no right to alter what the Church has given him to do, until the Church herself is wise enough to tell him how to alter it.

From the historical view of the nature of the Ritual here given, I think every Catholic minded inquirer will admit that the obligation of the officiating Priest to abstain from all tampering with the Ritual has been an uniform and universal principle in every age and in every portion of the Church Catholic from the beginning. Hence, if there be an "entire liberty" of Ritual vested in the Priests of the Church in the United States, it was not derived from any right that belonged to them as ministers of the Catholic and Apostolic Church, but it must be a new power conferred on them by some special legislation in either the Anglican or American Branch of the Church. It has never been a Catholic principle. It has never been recognized as a right in any primitive or Catholic Ritual. Has the Legislation of the Church in either England or America conferred any such unprecedented authority on the ministers at their altars? Quite the reverse; for not only has the great weight of opinion among "all sorts and conditions of men" in the Church sustained the old view of a strict conformity to the Ritual Law, but it has been fully and repeatedly applied by the most emphatic and unmistakable Legislation. I am glad to have upon this point the support of the very able writer above referred to as claiming "entire liberty of Ritual as a strikingly distinctive feature of the American Church." He says:¹

"There is a general desire to put down anybody who * * acts in a manner decidedly different from other people. In the Anglican branch of the Church this feeling is *intensified* by the *acts of uniformity* under which the Church of England has been doing her work in shackles from the Reformation until now; and also by the determination so *strongly expressed* in the Preface to the English Book, that, whereas heretofore there hath been great diversity in saying and singing in Churches within this realm, * * now from henceforth *all the whole Realm shall have but one use*." There is a sort of oral tradition, therefore, in the Anglican branch of the Church, that there must be uniformity in public worship."

¹ Church and World, N. Y., 1879, Oct., p. 384. Italics, etc., are mine.

This statement is thoroughly correct in its expression of both the facts and opinions on the matter in question which had existed in the Anglican Church for at least two centuries before the time of the formation of the American Book, and were then universally accepted. And it shows also the principles under which the framers of the American Ritual had been trained and always continued to think and legislate. The English Church had from its foundation always recognized and applied the Catholic doctrine in reference to the authoritative obligation of the accepted Ritual in each Diocese. In the exercise of their old powers in the details of their service, there had been certain modifications of the original Augustinian Liturgy in a few of the Dioceses. Hence there were several *uses*¹ employed in different Dioceses of the Mediæval Anglican Church. Such were the uses of Hereford, of Bangor and that of Sarum, which latter was adopted in the largest number of the English Dioceses. But there was no liberty of Ritual allowed in any portion of the Church of England, during all this period, for the individual minister, at his own option to select and combine, or in any way modify, the especial "use" which was imposed in his Diocese, as the Ritual he was to use. In those ages no minister would have ever ventured to claim so momentous a prerogative. But in the embittered contentions of the Reformation era each party sought every means to advance its own cause, and to depress that of its antagonist, and in the half century of these contests all the bands of Church discipline were rudely cast aside as seemed best at the moment to serve the interests of either of the contending factions. In this universal disorganization some of the clergy, in the excess of their zeal on the one side and

¹ "Use" is a technical ecclesiastical term, meaning much more than "usage" or "custom," it expresses that the offices to which it refers are the appointed services in the Diocese of which it is the "use;" and that this and this only is the form and order in which any of these services shall be performed by any minister of that Diocese.

the other, did for a time, and for the first time in the history of the Church, assume the power of making such adaptations of the Ritual as they thought best suited to their own ideas of what the Church's Liturgy ought to convey. And from this arose that "great diversity in saying and singing in the Churches" to which the preface to the English Prayer Book alludes; and the first step that the English Church made in the exercise of her inherent right as a branch of the Catholic Church, when she reformed her service, was to revise and unify these several Liturgies and reduce them to one "use," which instead of being merely Diocesan in its obligation, should henceforth be the sole authoritative or authorized standard for the Church of the whole Realm. This was no imposition of a new "shackle" on the Catholic liberty of the minister, but was only the continued operation of a principle which had until this never been denied by any true Churchman, but which the disorders and lawlessness of that troubled age made it now necessary to embody in Statutes and enforce by a law. Hence we find in the same act which imposed the First Revision (in 1549) of the Prayer Book of the Reformed Church the command, "All and singular ministers shall be bound to say and use the matins * * and celebration of the Lord's Supper * * IN SUCH *form and order as is mentioned* in said Book, and NONE OTHER OR OTHERWISE." This is repeated in still more exact and comprehensive terms in setting forth the alterations made in 1558: "If any manner of Parson * * refuse to use the said Common Prayers * * as they be set forth in said Book, or shall, willfully or obstinately standing in the same, use ANY OTHER rite, ceremony, order, form, or manner of celebrating the Lord's Supper openly or privily * * than IS MENTIONED and SET FORTH in said Book, he shall be subject" to the penalties in such case provided. This is again repeated in the act of Charles II. (1662), which also states one of the results to be attained by this

¹ Italics, etc., are my own.

uniformity, and which is strictly in accordance with what we have seen to be the Catholic idea from the beginning: i. e., "to the intent that every person within this Realm may certainly know the rule to which he is to conform in public worship and the administration of the Sacraments."

Thus the Anglican Revision of the Ritual accepted and applied the principle which had always been regarded as the fundamental basis of all Ritual Law wherever there had been a Ritual. It did not impose any "shackles" upon the Clergy. No Priest in the unreformed Anglican Church would have claimed any liberty to add to or modify her Ritual according to his will. The reformed church used her influence both in these lawless times, and in the Puritan revolt in later days, to have the statutes of the Realm embody and enforce the principle of Ritual which was as universal and almost as ancient as the Church's being. But it was not in the statutes of the Parliament alone, that this obligation was recognized. The Canons of the Convocation in 1603 were the work of the Church and the Church only, and were never passed in Parliament. Hence whatever may be said of the Acts of Uniformity as being only the action of the State, there can be no such objection to the Canons of 1603, which by the universal judgment of both lawyers and ecclesiastics bind the Church and clergy, even although not obligatory on the laity. And among these, Canon XIV. directs, "All ministers shall observe the orders, rites and ceremonies prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer *

* * without *either* DIMINISHING * * * in any respect * * * OR ADDING *anything in the matter or form thereof*." And thus the Church by her own sole and unquestioned action repeats the old and correct principle in all its fulness, and makes it authoritatively binding on all her clergy. "They must not use any other rite or manner;" they must not "diminish aught from that which was appointed;" they must not "add anything in either the matter or the form thereof" to what is commanded.

A claim, however, is still made by some that there is

somehow and somewhere a certain right to use some portions of the old Sarum or others of the ante-Reformation Liturgies of the English Church. It has been maintained that "Some of the *prescribed* Ritual of the Sarum use was omitted at the Reformation, but whatever was not specifically and by name rejected remained a part of the Church's lawful inheritance." It is true that such acts and accompaniments of the Catholic usages as had come down by Common Law, passed on, like all other matters of Common Law, without any break or change, and are still continued in the service, where they never have been interrupted nor even questioned. But it was not so with the definite and appointed words and usages which were "not retained" in the revision, and had not "continued in unbroken use" as portions of the Church's Common Law. For as some of the ministers who still held to their allegiance to the Pope as paramount to the authority of the Church of England, endeavored surreptitiously to continue parts of the old services which had not been "retained" in the Revised Liturgy, the English Church expressed her intention in this matter most unmistakably by having a Statute passed in 1550 which commanded:

"That, Since the Common Prayer had been set forth * * * corrupt, untrue, vain and superstitious services should be disused, and THEREFORE, (mark the application of this premise), ALL books called Antiphoners, Grailles, Missals, Manuals, Legends, Aves, Portuasses, Primers in Latin or English, Couchers, Journals, Ordinals, or OTHER BOOKS or writings heretofore used for the service of the Church (other than such as are or shall be set forth by the King's Majesty), shall be by the present act clearly and utterly abolished and forbidden to be used in this Realm."

This does not really say any more than was implied in the very fact of an authoritative revision for the purpose that "the whole Realm should have but one use," as the Canon of 1603 explicitly affirmed. But it was worded thus exhaustively that there might be no room to question what was the intention of the Church, and that she did prohibit "specifically and by name" every part and act of



the Sarum and all other earlier Rituals whatever which had been "cut away and clean rejected" by their omission from the appointed words and acts of the revised Liturgy.

There can be no doubt that such was the mind and purpose of the Church of England at the time of the Revision of the Ritual in 1549; and as little, that it continued to be the uniform and accepted principle of that Church at the time when the organization of the Church in the United States was effected. Along with the doctrine of the Apostolic Succession, it occupied the position of a fundamental axiom in the Church of England, and with the fathers and organizers of the American branch of the Church. It was the boast, and was thought to be the safeguard of the Church, that her teaching by the Ritual was and should continue to be UNIFORM. It was the standing taunt of the Puritan that *his* minister was not bound to any settled rite or form, but had that liberty of worship which would allow him to impress his own thoughts on the service and sacraments, as well as in the preaching of the Gospel.

With the Church feeling, such as we have expressed, held at that time as the admitted doctrine of the Church of England, it would require clear and emphatic evidence to show that the precisely opposite idea had been "deliberately adopted at the organization of the American Church after the Revolutionary War," and that the Church in the United States intended to introduce an "entire liberty of Ritual" as "a strikingly distinctive feature in the American Church." This very claim is an admission that such liberty had no support in Catholic precedents. While so far is it from being true that such was the action or the intention of the American Churchmen, the very opposite was the case. If any historic fact can be considered certain, it is that the framers of our Liturgy "did not intend to depart from the Church of England in any essential point of doctrine, discipline or worship, or further than local circumstances require." This is their solemn assertion in the Preface of the Prayer Book, which was "established and set forth" as

a part of our Book of Common Prayer; and is to be regarded as the authoritative announcement by the American Church of the causes that led to our revision of the English offices, and of the principles on which our services were all prepared. And certainly no point of discipline and worship was considered more essential in the Church of England at that time, and continuously for two hundred years before, than the obligation of the officiating minister to perform the Ritual as the Church had appointed it; "Neither diminishing in aught nor adding anything in the matter or the form thereof." What is thus apparent from the general relation of the American Churchmen to the Church of England at this period, is abundantly confirmed by the memoirs and correspondence of all the prominent actors in that great work whose writings or opinions have been preserved to us, so far as I have ever known them, or seen them quoted. And it is also established in the clearest manner by the forms and requirements of both the Prayer Book and the Constitution of the Church, as these have been adopted by the Church in the United States.

The language of the title page adopted and set forth as descriptive of the character of the Prayer Book was identical with that of the English Book, which we have seen to be expressive of the purpose that the whole Realm was to have but one form, and that was to be "according to the use of the Church of England." So, too, our own, is "According to THE USE of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America;" and was meant to express the same intention. The Book itself "was established and set forth" under an Article (8) in a Constitution formed before the Prayer Book was prepared, and which ordained that it "Shall be used in the Protestant Episcopal Church in those States which have adopted" this Constitution; while in another Article (7) it commands that "No person shall be ordained until he have subscribed a declaration that, 'I do solemnly engage to conform to the doctrines and worship of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States.'"

And, that there may be no mistake in both the obligation to conform, and the rule to which he must conform, the candidate for Priesthood must promise, before he receive the power to perform her "established" offices, that "by the help of the Lord," he will "ALWAYS so minister the doctrine and sacraments of Christ as the Lord hath commanded, and as THIS Church hath received the same." Here again is the same language as that of the Church of England, the manifest design of which was, as we have shown from the very language of the act imposing them "that every person in this Realm may certainly know the RULES to which he is to conform in * * * the administration of the sacraments and other rites and ceremonies of the Church."

There is no implication, even, in these, nor so far as any one has shown, in any other provision of the Prayer Book of the American Church, that the principle of Ritual liberty was adopted by the fathers of the Church in the United States. Their legislation was not hasty, nor without due consideration. For full five years, from 1784 to 1789, there were repeated Conventions and continual correspondence between the men who were most influential in giving the Prayer Book the form it finally received, and in these every portion and provision of the Ritual was most anxiously considered and discussed. I am sure no person reading either the correspondence or the stages of the public work could find in these the evidence that our Church has given or designed to give its individual ministers any liberty of Ritual other than the Church Catholic has always given, and the Church of England had most unequivocally affirmed, that is, the right and duty to perform the Ritual of the Church just as the Church in *which he held his orders* had commanded; omitting nothing; changing nothing; nor adding anything thereto, in either form or matter.

Canon 22, Title I. of the general Canon is the reaffirmation by the American Church of the same Catholic principles of Liturgical obligations, and both of its Sections involve precisely the same relations of the officiating priest to the services, viz :

§ I. That he shall introduce *no other prayers* than those of the appointed order.

§ II. That he shall introduce *no unordained ceremonies* into the performance of the same authorized Ritual.

If § II. is Rubrical, and hence unconstitutional and not binding on the Clergy, then § I. is the same, and we may add any prayers as well as do any acts that we wish. Or, if the obligations with regard to either the prayers or the practices, rest solely on the Canon, and not on universal Catholic principles, then if any one General Convention should repeal the whole Canon, every priest would be at liberty to alter the prayers as well as the ceremonial, and thus by his mere individual will make "alterations or additions" in the Prayer Book from Sunday to Sunday, a thing which is forbidden the whole Church in the United States to do without three years of delay, and the voice of two General Conventions.

The Ritual of the American Church thus continues and applies precisely the same relation between the officiating Priest and the Liturgic services, which the true Catholic idea has always recognized and enforced. The "Priest at her Altar" is not there with "entire liberty of Ritual" either as one of the "strikingly distinctive features of the American Church" or on any other ground than that of the Puritan conception, of the inherent right of every man to decide how he will perform the worship of the Church in such manner as may seem to himself the best adapted to the edification of the congregation and to express his own views of doctrine. Such has never been the principle of the American Church, is not so now, and if she shall maintain the true Catholic conception, can never be.

I have not gone into the details of any of the special things which are in issue in the present controversies about Ritual. The acts themselves are, many of them, of very little moment whether they be done or not. It cannot matter very much, intrinsically, what is the cut or name or color of the vestments of the minister. It will not affect

the grace of the Eucharist whether it be administered with leavened bread or with azymes; nor whether the wine be unmixed or mingled with a little water in the chalice. Whatever of them all the Church should order, all loyal ministers would instantly and gladly do. Nor is it an issue of very much importance just what may be the construction of a doubtful or disputed Rubric, for this is only a difference of opinion between those who recognize the same fundamental principles of the Church's power. The vital question now involved in these new claims of ministerial liberty of Ritual, is of far higher moment, and concerns the very power of the Church to continue in the authoritative exercise of her high functions as the *Ecclesia docens*. It is no less than this: "Shall the Church in the United States, for the first time in the history of any part of the Church Catholic, abandon her prerogative as the teacher of the people, by her appointed forms and acts; and admit the principle that every or any of her ministers shall have the right to introduce all such symbolic acts, into her highest and most sacred offices as he may deem advisable as a means of giving his own interpretation to the doctrines of her Liturgy?" If the acts which he interpolates mean nothing, why then disturb the order of the Church with them? If they do involve some important phase of doctrine, shall any minister be authorized to make the Church's Ritual the agent of his thoughts in ways which she has refused to order? An entire liberty of Ritual such as this, is at the same time uncatholic in principle, unwarranted by law in any branch of the Church Catholic, and will be suicidal of the Faith in any Church that should permit its exercise. Hence, on the concurrent grounds of uniform Catholic opinion, and actual legal enactments, we must conclude that both in its intention and its definite obligations, the Ritual Law of the Church in the United States is just what it has ever been, a form of worship and an embodiment of doctrine appointed by the Church herself. And as it is the Church's voice, the individual minister has no authority to

either add to, or alter any of the words which she has given him to say, or any of the actions she has commanded him to do. The sole question that any true Catholic Churchman ought to ask is, has "this Church," before whose Altar I stand as minister, ordained that her Priests should perform these actions, or appointed that they should employ these words which I am now about to use in the performance of her Liturgy.

J. F. GARRISON.

THE MISSIONARY EPISCOPATE AND MISSIONARY JURISDICTIONS.

It has been much disputed of late whether the Diocese or the Parish is the unit of ecclesiastical organization and life. Are parishes formed by the Diocese, or is the Diocese formed by an aggregation or union of parishes? Is the Diocese prior in idea and in fact, or do the parishes antedate and determine the Diocese? Probably many intelligent laymen and rectors of large parishes take the latter view. It was doubtless held quite generally by American churchmen till within a recent period. The former is maintained by those who see some evils in our prevailing ecclesiastical system and practice, who complain of congregationalism in the Church, who would revive primitive discipline and usages.

There is much to be said for the latter theory. In the American Church, Parishes were before Dioceses. Dioceses were formed by the rectors and representative laymen of parishes or congregations having already a corporate existence, as dioceses subsequently united to form the Province or the National Church. It is possible that some of our legislation has been based on the idea of the autonomy or independence of parishes. Practically, at least, the theory has been widely admitted and acted upon.

And yet there has been a growing recognition of the other theory, as if from a consciousness often not understood or not acknowledged that it is or ought to be true. In many of the Dioceses, in nearly all of those recently formed, the Conventions have by legislation determined how and under what conditions parishes should be organized, what officers they should have, and their powers and functions, and have prescribed for them their charters and constitutions. This makes the Diocese the unit and source of power above and independently of the Parishes.

It would seem difficult, too, to reconcile the other view with the polity of the Episcopal Church. According to our interpretation of the New Testament and early Church History, "the Church" is not merely the single congregation. The word is always used of the Christians of a city or country. It is applied invariably to the Diocese, or jurisdiction of a Bishop, or to the Province, embracing several dioceses: as the church at Jerusalem, Antioch, Corinth, Ephesus, Rome. The Societies of Independents, holding the view that the New Testament writers never mean anything by "the Church" but a single congregation, meeting and worshipping in some place, give all ecclesiastical powers to the individual congregation. Congregations may unite and form Conferences or Associations, but these have no authority save that which the congregations choose to give them. The Congregation is self-governing, may frame its own Articles of Faith, and even ordain its ministers. To the mind of a Churchman this view is inconsistent with all the facts of Apostolic history and ecclesiastical usage in all ages. But does it differ essentially from that which makes the Parish first, actually and in idea, and the Diocese a convenient union of Parishes? And if the Diocese is a federation of Parishes, and the Province as represented in the General Convention, a federation of Dioceses, why may not a Diocese separate itself from the general Church, and a Parish in like manner, from the Diocese, resuming the exercise of its original and independent rights? Some

Churchmen hold this view, at least as to the right of a Diocese to separate and to revert to self-government; as a school of politicians held that a State might rightfully secede. But we do not see how such a theory can be fairly distinguished from "congregationalism." They who hold that the Province is the ecclesiastical unit are possibly nearer the truth. The Parish cannot perpetuate itself unless the congregation can ordain its ministers. The Diocese cannot continue its own life unless the Bishop can ordain his successor. The Province alone can be self-perpetuating under the ancient and universal rule of at least three consecrators for the commissioning of a Bishop in the Church of God.

But are any of these views adequate? Is not the unity of the Church in the Episcopate? Is not the Bishop the unit sought for, or if not the individual Bishop, the College of Bishops as represented in the Province? No doubt the whole Church was first in Jesus Christ, the Incarnate Son of God. "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth." He delegated to the apostles such powers as they would need, for the organizing, instructing, guiding the Church. "As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you." The Church comes down from above; it does not grow up from beneath. It is "from heaven" and not "of men." The apostles were "sent," not "called" of the people. They send others. They commission presbyters and deacons. They hold "the brethren" responsible for the exercise of a lower but true "vocation and ministry." But they were made by Jesus Christ the source of ecclesiastical powers under and subordinately to Himself. In thought and in reality the ecclesiastical unit was the College of the Apostles. In due time the apostles separated. They went forth to preach the Gospel to every creature, to add to the Church such as would put themselves in the way of being saved, and to plant the Church in every nation. Every apostle or apostle-bishop laboring in his own field or jurisdiction was doubtless subject to the College of Apostles;

but surely he was not amenable to the congregations he called into existence, nor to the presbyters and other ministers he placed over them. These congregations were not separate units. They were not sources of power. They were one in their head. In the Episcopate was their unity. In the Bishop and in the counsellors and helpers he called around him and intrusted with their functions were the powers of legislating, governing, feeding, ruling the congregations over which he held jurisdiction.

The true theory cannot be in conflict with the facts of apostolic times and apostolic and primitive history. Looking at the matter historically, taking facts as they have been from the beginning to the time of the founding of our American Church, no one would venture to say that the unit was the congregation or what we now call the Parish. Christianity did not spread throughout the world on that theory. In no part of the world were missions conducted by presbyters or laymen first gathering congregations and constituting what we call Parishes, and then organizing these into Dioceses. There is no See in England that is not older than the Parishes it contains. Every Diocese, whether growing out of the mission of St. Augustine or that of Lindisfarne or of the Holy Isle, antedated the congregations and was for the purpose of forming congregations and building them up in the Faith. Even in the exceptional cases, where new missionary work had been begun by presbyters or by laymen, where the brethren "scattered abroad" preached the Word as was their privilege, or where priests or evangelists went forth to preach and to baptize, the people gathered into the fold did not organize the Diocese and elect their Bishop. The organic Church life and conciliar or synodical action only began with the constituting of the See and the placing it in charge of the Bishop. The general rule in the early Church, in the early Middle Ages, and in all the great missionary periods, undoubtedly was, for the Bishop to go forth with his missionaries, as the apostles were originally sent to evangelize the world,

invested with the same apostolic commission, to call, teach, and send other ministers and assign them their work, to gather congregations, to establish schools and other Christian institutions, to organize the Church, to constitute the Diocese, to give it all things essential to its integrity, life, health, and growth. Even Gibbon admitted that as a matter of fact in the primitive times there was no Church without its Bishop. So in all ages the maxim "*nulla Ecclesia sine episcopo*" has been true.

A different system was followed in planting the Church in the Colonies of America in the last century, and its disastrous results are apparent to this day. Presbyters were sent out as missionaries by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, to minister chiefly to the colonists and to establish parishes. In theory they were but extending the great Diocese of London, for they were under the nominal jurisdiction of the Bishop of London. But as he could never visit them, they were practically an Episcopal Church without the Episcopacy. With the revival of the missionary spirit in the present century, the Church of England took warning from her former mistakes and failures, and, somewhat blindly it is true, sought to return to the method of the apostles and the primitive Church, by which England herself had been Christianized. Her great missionary societies have been first in every field. But presbyters sent as the first pioneers have not been considered as rendering Missionary Bishops unnecessary. It was not these, but the Bishops sent forth from the Mother Church, that have organized missionary Dioceses and Provinces in every part of the British Empire. Middleton was not elected Bishop by Christian colonists in Calcutta; not so did Selwyn go to New Zealand, nor Mountain to Quebec, nor Strachan to Toronto. They were sent. They went with authority. Missions, parishes, schools, and other institutions sprang into existence under their inspiration, prompting, labors and oversight. Whatever may have been done previously by the great missionary societies, whatever

success had attended the labors of individual missionaries, however numerous they may have become and however extensive their work, they have not been permitted to organize themselves into Dioceses and elect their Bishop and undertake church legislation. The Society at home has been the governing power, the unit and source of administration. The development of local church organization has begun only when the See was constituted, the endowment secured, and the Bishop appointed, consecrated and sent. It is his work from his See as a centre, from the church which he adopts or builds as his cathedral, to form the Diocese, with such powers of synodical action as may be expedient. The fact that an endowment for the support of the episcopate must be secured before the See is constituted may sometimes unduly postpone the sending of the Bishop; but it has at least this one all-important advantage, of making the See permanent, and the Bishop's tenure of office perpetual. He can indeed resign or be transferred to another sphere of labor, but he cannot be superseded. While he lives and is in charge, no other can be elected and substituted in his place.

The Church, when instinct with missionary life, and active and zealous in her great work of evangelization, will always, though it be but gradually and perhaps blunderingly, fall back from defective or erroneous, upon right principles, and instinctively adopt right methods; and these principles and methods are primitive and catholic. The instinct that prompts and guides is the Holy Spirit working and energizing in the Body. So striving in the most effective manner to do her work, she returns to the old paths, even though not consciously seeking them, that she may walk therein.

It was the poverty of our Church, as well as an erroneous theory, that led to the sending forth of Missionary Bishops with no Sees and no provision for support but the salary pledged by the Board of Missions. In one view this was right. It was acting to a certain extent on right principles.

invested with the same apostolic commission, to call, teach, and send other ministers and assign them their work, to gather congregations, to establish schools and other Christian institutions, to organize the Church, to constitute the Diocese, to give it all things essential to its integrity, life, health, and growth. Even Gibbon admitted that as a matter of fact in the primitive times there was no Church without its Bishop. So in all ages the maxim "*nulla Ecclesia sine episcopo*" has been true.

A different system was followed in planting the Church in the Colonies of America in the last century, and its disastrous results are apparent to this day. Presbyters were sent out as missionaries by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, to minister chiefly to the colonists and to establish parishes. In theory they were but extending the great Diocese of London, for they were under the nominal jurisdiction of the Bishop of London. But as he could never visit them, they were practically an Episcopal Church without the Episcopacy. With the revival of the missionary spirit in the present century, the Church of England took warning from her former mistakes and failures, and, somewhat blindly it is true, sought to return to the method of the apostles and the primitive Church, by which England herself had been Christianized. Her great missionary societies have been first in every field. But presbyters sent as the first pioneers have not been considered as rendering Missionary Bishops unnecessary. It was not these, but the Bishops sent forth from the Mother Church, that have organized missionary Dioceses and Provinces in every part of the British Empire. Middleton was not elected Bishop by Christian colonists in Calcutta; not so did Selwyn go to New Zealand, nor Mountain to Quebec, nor Strachan to Toronto. They were sent. They went with authority. Missions, parishes, schools, and other institutions sprang into existence under their inspiration, prompting, labors and oversight. Whatever may have been done previously by the great missionary societies, whatever

success had attended the labors of individual missionaries, however numerous they may have become and however extensive their work, they have not been permitted to organize themselves into Dioceses and elect their Bishop and undertake church legislation. The Society at home has been the governing power, the unit and source of administration. The development of local church organization has begun only when the See was constituted, the endowment secured, and the Bishop appointed, consecrated and sent. It is his work from his See as a centre, from the church which he adopts or builds as his cathedral, to form the Diocese, with such powers of synodical action as may be expedient. The fact that an endowment for the support of the episcopate must be secured before the See is constituted may sometimes unduly postpone the sending of the Bishop; but it has at least this one all-important advantage, of making the See permanent, and the Bishop's tenure of office perpetual. He can indeed resign or be transferred to another sphere of labor, but he cannot be superseded. While he lives and is in charge, no other can be elected and substituted in his place.

The Church, when instinet with missionary life, and active and zealous in her great work of evangelization, will always, though it be but gradually and perhaps blunderingly, fall back from defective or erroneous, upon right principles, and instinctively adopt right methods; and these principles and methods are primitive and catholic. The instinet that prompts and guides is the Holy Spirit working and energizing in the Body. So striving in the most effective manner to do her work, she returns to the old paths, even though not consciously seeking them, that she may walk therein.

It was the poverty of our Church, as well as an erroneous theory, that led to the sending forth of Missionary Bishops with no Sees and no provision for support but the salary pledged by the Board of Missions. In one view this was right. It was acting to a certain extent on right principles.

It was recognizing the Bishop as the head and organizer of missionary work. It was sending him forth into the wilderness of uncared-for souls, as the apostles were sent at the first, to lay the foundations, and to gather the helpers and the means to build up the superstructure of the Church. So went forth Kemper in 1835 to organize and build up parishes and dioceses in the great Northwest, the proof and witness of the new era of revived missionary life in the Episcopal Church in this country. But he had no See till he had made one. It is at least conceivable that he might have been superseded by others being successively elected as Bishops of the several dioceses which he was the instrument of creating. It is true that in no instance of the forming of a diocese out of a missionary jurisdiction has this result followed, nor is it likely to follow in the future. But the possibility is an anomaly in our system. It should be removed as soon as possible.

The movement for diocesan organization should come from the Missionary Bishop. Every consideration should impel him to this step as soon as practicable. But he may well hesitate when he must put his future in the hands of a Diocesan Convention, though of his own creation, and face the possibility of being set aside as he is but beginning his work and learning how to do it most effectively. It has been said that "all Bishops are unpopular." A distinguished presbyter lately remarked that "there are few Bishops in the Church who could be re-elected if they were subjected anew to this ordeal and the election were to be free and without moral constraint." These are extreme opinions, with but small foundation of truth, and yet it is impossible to foresee what fatal results might not follow from mere restlessness, instability, and love of change or ambition. The very faithfulness and efficiency of the Missionary Bishop might in some cases make his position insecure.

The duties of a Missionary Bishop are arduous and not seldom painful in the performance. He must be for a time, of necessity, the chief executive of most of the work, even in

detail. His helpers will not always be the most loyal. He finds by sad experience that he cannot trust everybody. He learns that to be sure a thing will be done he must do it himself. He is to set things in order and supply what things are wanting; to correct what is wrong; to discipline offenders. He will in doing this be very likely to set himself against things and persons that are popular, and thus incur reproach. An ambitious presbyter might easily take advantage of these things, and by shrewdly laying his plans, by the acts of the demagogue—for such acts are sometimes practiced even in the Church—gain for himself the suffrages of the majority; or some unsuspecting and misguided clergyman might be urged into the position of successful candidacy. The spirit of independence, easily degenerating into lawlessness in a remote or new territory or country, is liable so to pervade the whole social atmosphere as to invade the Church and to infect and influence the clergy. But each cannot be allowed to do what is right in his own eyes. The Bishop is the only one who has the authority and the responsibility for checking abuses and restraining such evils. Bishop Otey used to say that in the early years of his episcopate he deposed more clergy than he ordained. Other Missionary Bishops have had a like experience. Some missionary jurisdictions have at some time in their history been called, justly or unjustly, the "Botany Bay" of unworthy ministers, who had found it convenient to leave the East. These men have their friends, and the calling them to account involves peril. The present Missionary Bishops have all learned to exercise the greatest care in the selection of their clergy. Probably the missionaries now laboring in the great missionary districts west of the Missouri are not surpassed by any equal number in ability and earnestness, and true, loyal, and successful work. If remaining long at their posts, they become superior to most others, as their work among western people with their more intense life and greater general intelligence, calls for and develops higher qualities of character. And yet the evils spoken of will

sometimes exist, and the Bishop who sets himself to correct them must take the risk of opposition, misrepresentation, and contumely, while he will not shrink from his plain duty.

It has been thought that the provision allowing the election and transfer of a Missionary Bishop to a Diocese gave a certain privilege and pre-eminence. But there is evidently a growing prejudice against such transfer. It would now lower a Bishop, accepting such election, in the public estimation. The Canon allowing it is likely hereafter to be a dead letter and might as well be repealed.

We have said enough to show that our Canon law in respect to the formation of Dioceses in missionary jurisdictions is unprimitive, uncatholic, and radically wrong. The grounds of this opinion might be given much more fully as they lie in many thoughtful minds. The time has come in the progress of our missionary work when our Bishops and Deputies in General Convention should consider how the law may be amended so as to bring our practice into accordance with the right and catholic principles which history shows to have always prevailed. We would recommend the repeal of § ix. of Canon 15, Title I., and the amendment of paragraph 5 of § vii. of the same Canon, so as to read substantially as follows :

"Any Bishop elected and consecrated under this section shall be entitled to a seat in the House of Bishops, and whenever there shall be the requisite number of clergy and parishes according to Section I. of this Canon, it shall be his duty to summon a Convention or Council for the organization of a Diocese within his jurisdiction ; and he shall be the Bishop of such Diocese when organized, without vacating his missionary appointment: *Provided*, that he continue to discharge the duties of Missionary Bishop within the residue of his original jurisdiction, if there be such residue."

It may be objected that this would violate the great principle of free selection of the Bishop by his clergy and people. But all beginnings are exceptional. In the erection of a new Diocese by division, the Bishop of the old Diocese may select the new, without election. The principle can only apply to Dioceses already in existence. To make it applicable in the founding of new Sees would be in

contravention of all Scripture and History. In such case the Church could never have had Bishops. And as a matter of fact, the clergy of a Missionary Bishop do virtually choose him by going out to work under him. And the faithful laity stand to him in the relation of St. Paul's converts to himself. He should be able to say to them: "If I be not an apostle unto others yet doubtless I am unto you, for the seal of my apostleship are ye in the Lord." The Bishop of Oregon or of Nevada has been as truly elected by his present flock as has the Bishop of Kansas or of Nebraska.

We believe that some such amendment will be sure to commend itself on due consideration to candid minds in the Church; and that it will certainly be made, if not by the next General Convention, as soon as the Church has come up to the full appreciation of her position and duty as a Missionary Body.

Another change in this Canon is desirable if not essential. There is room for serious doubt whether the clergy and members of the Church in a missionary jurisdiction are subject to any Canons but those of the General Convention. In paragraph 4, § vii, Canon 15, Title I, it is provided that "each Missionary Bishop shall have jurisdiction over the clergy in the District assigned him," and that "in the case of the trial of a clergyman," "the clerical members of the Standing Committee appointed by the Missionary Bishop, as is hereinafter provided, may make presentment, and the trial shall take place according to the Constitution and Canons of any Diocese of this Church which may have been selected by the said Missionary Bishop at the time of the appointment of such Standing Committee."

It is optional, then, with the Missionary Bishop whether he will make such selection. What if he has neglected or declined to do so? He could probably constitute his court of three presbyters, and as there would be no canonical provisions to guide him the trial must take place according to the rules of procedure in civil courts. But why are "the

Constitution and Canons of any Diocese" here spoken of? What have Diocesan Constitutions to do with the trial of a clergyman? What code of Diocesan Canons is there in which more than a single Canon would be applicable? Is it intended that, if the Bishop select the Constitution and Canons of any Diocese, such Constitution and Canons are to constitute the law of the jurisdiction for all purposes for which a Constitution and Canons are required in the Dioceses? This is clearly the design. Why then is it not explicitly provided? It looks as if either there was an essential omission by an oversight, or the Church intended the Missionary Bishop to be the law-making power, under the General Canons and law of the Church, for the government of his jurisdiction, as in fact he must be as the law now stands.

We therefore propose that a paragraph to be numbered (7) be introduced after paragraph (6) § vii, Canon 15, Title I., to the following effect:

"Every such Bishop shall select at the time of the first appointment of such Standing Committee the Constitution and Canons of some Diocese of this Church, and by the advice and consent of such Standing Committee, he shall make such modifications in the said Constitution and Canons as in his and their judgment local circumstances may require; and the Constitution and Canons so modified shall be in force and valid for the government of his jurisdiction until a Diocesan Convention or Council lawfully organized shall frame the Constitution and Canons of his Diocese."

There is much uncertainty among our clergy as to the powers of a Bishop in reference to his clergy and parishes when he makes a visitation and at other times when present in his churches. That he may administer the Holy Communion when visiting a church is settled now by Canon. There is a diversity of opinion even among the Bishops themselves as to whether the Bishop may control the services and the disposition of the offertory. The extraordinary statement has been ventured in a pamphlet put forth by several distinguished clergymen that he can only officiate in any church in his Diocese on suffrage of the rector, except on the rare occasions, "at least once in three years,"

when he gives the requisite notice of a formal visit for a confirmation. For our part we do not believe that under the General Canons or those of any Diocese, rectorial rights can thus exclude the Bishop from the performance of his legitimate duties. No Canons can be so understood as to over-ride the Ordinal or the Rubrics, or the necessary inferences therefrom. When a church is placed under the Bishop's "spiritual jurisdiction," as it is when consecrated, something more must be meant than that he can once in three years or oftener, hold confirmation in a parish. But, however it may be in organized Dioceses, there is no such limitation in missionary jurisdictions. The Missionary Bishop has much more to do than to confirm, or to confirm and ordain. He has larger functions than mere oversight. He is the pioneer missionary, the chief preacher, the administrator, the executive, as well as the ever present efficient overseer of all the work of his appointed field. He comes as near as is possible in these times, to being what the apostles were and what bishops were in the primitive Church. He is sent forth by the House of Bishops as were the apostles from the Apostolic College in Jerusalem, to preach the Gospel, to evangelize and receive into the Church the people for whom he is appointed, and build them up in the Faith. Whatever may have been done before him by clergy or laity, whatever organizations may have been established, he is none the less the head of all the work. There can be nothing obstructive of his efforts, but the world and sin and satan; he is sent to fight and to overcome. There can as yet be no ecclesiastically legal parish, for there has been no law for the forming of parishes, and no guarantees required or given of adherence to the doctrine, discipline, and worship of the Church. Various persons calling themselves Episcopalians, or professing a preference for the Church's services, may have associated themselves together to build a church and to support a minister. Such associations may have become incorporated and thus acquired a civil status. In the view of the

State or Territorial law, they are what they call themselves, but they are not Parishes of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, till they are pledged in their Charter or Constitution to the doctrine and usages of the church, and the Bishop as the ecclesiastical authority has given them recognition; nor is church property safe in their hands. His sanction is necessary to the organizing of a parish or a mission. He prescribes the manner in which they are to organize, their Constitution and the laws for their government, having power to select Canons in which these things are determined. He can send missionaries and fill vacancies without waiting for the "call" of vestries. He can preach and officiate in any and every church whensoever and as often as he deems proper. He can select any church as his cathedral, antecedently to any being duly organized in accordance with the law of the Church and recognized by him as having the rights of Parishes. He can create and establish parish boundaries, change them at will and determine their limits, acting by the advice and consent of the Standing Committee. Whenever present in a church he is present as a Bishop, as chief missionary. He may take such part as he desires, and assign the parts to the clergy. He is the unit of administration, the centre of gravity, the source of jurisdiction. He represents the powers that after Diocesan organization will be vested in the Bishop and Convention, and thus possesses not only executive but also judicial and legislative functions. He is responsible to the House of Bishops for all his acts, and he is the only one who is responsible to any outside authority. They whom he has called to his aid are responsible to him and he must see that they perform their duties. Of course, he must not be arbitrary nor dictatorial. He must exercise his functions and fulfil his responsibilities with great care and full consideration of others. His government is eminently paternal. His extensive powers must in due time be limited. He must begin from the first to distribute them and

to share them with others. Thus he is required to appoint a Standing Committee—his council of advice. He will select fit men for other offices as they are needed. He will designate a Treasurer of Missions, a Chancellor or legal adviser. As his working force increases, he organizes a Convocation of clergy and laity, and this body elects a clerical and a lay representative to the General Convention, and though not empowered for legislation, it has its officers and liberty of action in relation to educational and missionary work. He will make his Convocation as important a body as possible, and encourage their action and welcome the aid of their counsels. And as soon as the jurisdiction is ripe for it, he should organize his Diocese and make the Convocation its representative body, and secure its admission into the family of Dioceses.

There are probably some missionary jurisdictions in which Dioceses might well be organized. Indeed, there are several Dioceses that did not attain for several years, and some that have not yet attained, the strength, as determined by numbers and contributions, that are already found in one or two of the missionary districts. Our ecclesiastical system and law ought to be such as to encourage and help the Bishop to lead the movement for Diocesan organization. But as the law stands, he is prompted to organize at once on reaching his field, prematurely; or else to postpone action, it may be, too long.

We have seen one cause of delay in the fact that he may be superseded. Another is that Diocesan organization involves an abridgement of his powers. Still another, and the most important, is the difficulty of securing an endowment for his support; for it is not probable that in future a Missionary Bishop after becoming a Diocesan will be able to retain his salary from the Board of Missions, because of continued superintendence of some remote and outlying parts of his original jurisdiction. It is here that the vice of our present system chiefly appears. Ought we not to adopt the policy of the English Church? In forming new

jurisdictions, at any rate, should not a See be chosen and constituted and an adequate endowment secured? The Missionary Bishop would then go forth to establish his mission and organize his Diocese with the feeling of independence, which is so desirable, his position and support for life being placed beyond contingency.

That the endowment of the missionary Episcopates was contemplated by the Church, is evident from the enactments of Canon 3, Title III, a Canon of whose existence apparently few of the wealthy laity know. It seems at all events, to be almost wholly inoperative. It will be a long time before any missionary district becomes a Diocese, if an endowment must first be secured, and it is to wait till the manner prescribed in this Canon is effectual. Nothing more forcibly illustrates the apathy of the rich members of our Church in regard to the cause of Missions than the prevailing ignorance of this Canon, or the neglect to act upon it. We have heard it said that there are rich communicants in some of the older Dioceses, of tried and proved liberality, who are in great doubt for what objects they should give, who would give munificently if they could only know what objects really deserve and need their aid, and that their money would be faithfully and wisely used. We have often wondered that there are so few large gifts and bequests in our Church, while hundreds of thousands in other Christian bodies are annually bestowed by individuals in supporting and endowing their colleges and other Christian and beneficiary institutions. There are scores of rich men and women in our Church, who would each gladly put a Church School, especially in the far West where such institutions are most needed, upon a permanent and secure foundation, or fully endow a missionary Diocese, if their attention could be properly called to its importance and the urgent need were duly impressed upon them. When it is considered that a large part of the funds of the Board of Missions would thus be set free for the support of other missionaries, the suggestion is certainly

not inappropriate that the members of the Committees and their general agents should make the securing of such endowments a principal part of their work, and that the General Convention should, as soon as possible, devise some effectual means by which the great object of the Canon might be fulfilled.

There are some, perhaps, who will urge that the laity of the missionary districts should endow the Dioceses to be formed from them; especially as these districts are said to have great natural resources, several of them, in the precious metals, and all the various industries are eminently productive. This plea would have some force if the resources of the districts were any fair measure of the wealth of the people. But in reality these resources are but partially developed. There is but little accumulated capital. The first settlers are not generally those who succeed. They are for the most part poor. They are migratory in their habits. Many are adventurers who hope to find some easy road to fortune. The industrious have a hard struggle for a livelihood. They are creators of wealth, not for themselves but for others. The great capitalists mostly of our Eastern cities, secure the rich returns. Granted that the endowments should come from the wealth made from railroad stocks, grazing, farming, mining, or whatever other resources of these new countries. It would be but right. But where is it to be found? Not there, but here in our great business centres. Unfortunately, a large part of it is in the hands of men who care not for the Church nor for Christianity. The time may come when wealth will accumulate in centres like Portland, Helena, Salt Lake, Denver, Santa Fe and Prescott, and Christian men and Churchmen may be expected to have their share. But the proper development of the Church's work ought not to wait on such probabilities.

It must not be forgotten that these fields are Missions, and that all the conditions of Church work require them to be so regarded. It is the law of the propagation of

Christianity from the beginning, since Christ came, sent of the Father to save a lost world, that the Gospel must be sent to those who need it, but who do not feel their need. The Church that sends must have her men and women whom God has blessed, ready to give ample support to the men whom she calls and whom the Spirit of God prompts to undertake so difficult but glorious mission, and put their support beyond question. There is no object before the Church having stronger claims upon the wealth of Churchmen than the endowment of the missionary jurisdictions and of the Dioceses to be formed within them.

Such endowments may be properly vested in the five laymen constituting the "Board of Trustees of the Missionary Bishops' Fund," until the Dioceses are formed. All who are disposed to give should have entire confidence in such a body, appointed as the Canon requires by the General Convention. But as soon as practicable, corporations should be formed in each missionary district, under the State or Territorial law, that shall be competent and safe to hold such endowment property and any other property acquired for the Church.

The vesting of school, mission, or other property in the Missionary Bishop and his successors in office, in trust, can be but a temporary expedient. Hitherto it has been safe. The courts have always protected such trusts, holding to the truth of the maxim that "a trust cannot be voided." Though the trustee might die or become incompetent to act, another would be appointed to carry out the purpose for which the trust was created. But there should be care in the terms of the conveyance. The deed should run: to the Bishop and his successors in office in trust for and his and their *heirs* as well as assigns; and a will properly drawn, or a declaration of trust to be duly recorded, should convey the property to the successor. Strictly speaking, such succession of a trusteeship is probably unknown to our law, unless it be under the form of a corporation sole, and such corporation cannot be inferred to

exist where there is no specific law creating or recognizing it. Bishops succeeding to such trusts under deeds conveying to them and their successors and assigns, have again and again validly conveyed such property, and titles thus given have never been disputed. But yet such form of investment is not desirable. The Board of Trustees of Church property in the missionary district should be formed and duly incorporated, and a decree of a Court of Equity obtained, empowering the Bishop to convey all real estate in his hands to such corporation, notwithstanding any informalities or defects in the instrument whereby he received it.

The question of the constitution of such Board of Trustees is one of great importance, and the only one which remains to be considered at the present time. The body to be incorporated should not be one arbitrarily created; it should be of natural growth. The leading officers of the jurisdiction with a fair proportion of laymen should compose it. First, there is the Bishop, the ecclesiastical authority, who will be the President. Then there are the members of the Standing Committee. To them may be added the Chancellor or legal adviser and the Treasurer. A Board of Trustees composed of these would be a perfectly natural one, and perhaps the best that could be devised for a new district. But in most of the older jurisdictions a larger body will be preferable. This may be secured by uniting with the above, other officers of the jurisdiction and of the central or cathedral church whom the progress of Church work will make necessary; such as the Diocesan Registrar, the Rural Deans, the Dean and Canons of the Cathedral, or chief clergy of the central or See city, and certain laymen representing the cathedral congregation. Such a body would thus have a local habitation and yet would be representative of the jurisdiction. The Bishop and Cathedral staff and the laymen resident in the Cathedral city would be the local or lesser Chapter, and have the management of the educational and mission work of the See city and vicinity

The full Board, including the outside members, the rural deans and a layman of each deanery, would be the greater Chapter, and would be as suitable a body as could be desired, to be the Board of Missions. The Nebraska plan, in short, in its essential features, only modified to suit the needs of different fields, is probably best adapted to the ends in view. It has been adopted, with slight modifications, in the Diocese of Kansas, and the Missionary Bishops of Colorado and of Northern Texas are working out their Chapters as corporate bodies on substantially the same lines. The proviso of the Resolution of the Board of Missions of 1877, concerning "the Title to Church property in Missionary Jurisdictions," should be made a part of the Charter of the Board, to wit: "That no transfer or alienation of any property shall be made without the consent and signature of the Bishop."

It is far better to have one such corporation to hold property for the various objects, than to begin with several, one for each of the more important. Separate Boards would be more or less in rivalry, and their special claims would interfere with the harmony and efficiency of the work. The unifying, the bringing into harmonious relations all parts of the work, is a prime condition of success. To secure this, they should start from unity, not diversity, and coördinate the several branches of the work, educational, missionary, eleemosynary, under a strong and representative body. Close corporations should be by all means avoided, as being beyond the control of the Diocesan Convention.

No doubt some persons will criticise sharply the young Missionary Bishops; young, as they imagine, in experience, if not in years, who display their ambition in aiming at a "hierarchy of clergy," and a cathedral system, when their cathedral should be "in their boots," when they should be constantly in the saddle, in the stage coach or buck-board, and have no local habitation or home. But most Church people are becoming too well instructed for such criticisms to have weight. Surely, it ought to be no novelty, when the

Church from the beginning has extended herself by working from great centres strongly occupied, when our own Mother Church of England always creates a See, preparatory to sending out a Missionary Bishop, and places him in a cathedral as the base from which he is to work, if the Missionary Bishop of our own Church, on the prairie or in the mountains, strives to realize what the whole history of the Church has sanctioned and common sense suggests to be both reasonable and expedient; if he makes for himself a home at some point which is, or which is to become a centre of population, of business, and ultimately of wealth; if he plant here his schools and a church where he can worship on his returns from his "journeyings oft," and his ministration to the scattered flocks and the sheep wandering astray in the wilderness; and at least, occasionally "preach the Word" for which he was ordained, and break to his people the Bread of Life; if he does, in fine, what all experience proves should be done in all other warfare, if he select and fortify a central base of operations, which can be securely held while the recruits are gained and the training and preparation are secured for the successful carrying on of the aggressive work abroad. What is advocated is simply the making and working from a centre or base. It will be ultimately seen that this plan of work, whether called or not the "cathedral system," which it really is, is far more effective than the opposite plan of "scattering;" that it gives strength rather than weakness, and that a Cathedral Chapter is not so very anomalous nor un-American, which shall include the lay element, the peculiar excellency of our American Church polity.

The Missionary Bishop, working in accordance with the genius of the Church as involved in her principles and seen in all her history, will necessarily have his Cathedral Chapter of counsellors and helpers under some form and name. He must inevitably adopt a centre and work from a base. His missions, schools, charitable institutions will ultimately radiate around this centre. He will have herein his church,

served it may be chiefly by another, called Dean, Rector or Minister, where the ritual of worship, the warmth and frequency of services and the mode of parochial and mission work, will be what he would desire as a model for the jurisdiction. He will train his candidates for Holy Orders, so far as is practicable, at his own home in both sacred learning and missionary duty. His deacons will have gained their first experience under his own eye, and he will know how soon and where to place them in responsible spheres of labor. There is probably no missionary jurisdiction with a resident Bishop where the work is not shaping itself in some such form as this.

If hindrances are not put in the way by the attempt to carry out a preconceived theory that the cathedral has no place in our system, Church organization will naturally take a cathedral form. The See will be a fact. The organization will be based upon it. The Chapter will be the result of the drawing together for counsel and mutual helpfulness in devising and consummating plans of work, of the Bishop and his leading men who are in places of trust and responsibility. Whatever other centres may be created they will group themselves around that of the Cathedral and be recognized and duly represented in the membership of the incorporated body. Even in the old Dioceses the cathedral system is seen to be inevitable, and is fast becoming a fact. Still more is it necessary, still more speedy and sure must be its realization, in new districts of country where there are no contrary precedents, and no organizations created on a contrary system to prevent its natural development.

THE BISHOP OF—————

CHURCH PRINCIPLES IN CHURCH HISTORY.

ST. CYPRIAN.

[CONCLUDED.]

While the Church owes to Cyprian the triumph of Episcopacy, she owes to him also, for good and for evil, more than to any one man, the formal transference to the Christian ministry of the Sacerdotalism of the Old Testament. The suspicion and even the hatred of Judaism, which had characterized many of the Gnostic sects, and which had required a very cautious handling of the Old Testament Scriptures by the Greek fathers, has no place whatever in the writings of Cyprian. He quotes from every part of the earlier revelation as if it were still appropriate, not only in spirit but in the letter, to the circumstances of the Christian Church. By far the longest of his treatises, under the not very appropriate title of "Three Books of Testimonies against the Jews," is a summary of Christian duty, consisting almost exclusively of passages of Scripture from both Testaments, without a hint that much of the old law is abrogated and can be applied to the Church of Christ no otherwise than by analogy or metaphor. In the interpretation of the Old Testament, it is, indeed, scarcely possible to find guides who must be followed with a more watchful caution than the early fathers generally, or Cyprian in particular. The slightest verbal parallelism is enough to induce them to construct a prophecy or even a formal and

everlasting law. This exceedingly fallacious method of interpretation has been continued to our own day; and it is adopted still, with almost undiminished confidence, by perhaps a majority of expositors. It very seriously lessens the value of patristic theology; and is at the bottom of some of the most dangerous corruptions of Christianity, both theoretical and practical. Very many examples could be selected from Cyprian's writings of misinterpretations so preposterous, that one can scarcely believe they do really occur in the letters of so shrewd and practical a father. Yet, perhaps, the strong, practical bent of Cyprian's mind may account for this very perversity. He wanted for the visible Church an inspired code of positive laws; and as he could not find them drawn out into minute detail in the New Testament, he sought them in the Old. We all know how easy it is to find anything in the Scriptures which we first have put there; and so we need not wonder that St. Cyprian could find the Gospel in the Law, and the ministers and sacraments of the Church in the ritual of Leviticus.

"Not only," says Professor Lightfoot, "does Cyprian use the terms *sacerdos*, *sacerdotium*, *sacerdotalis*, of the ministry, with a frequency hitherto without parallel, but he treats all the passages in the Old Testament which refer to the privileges, the sanctions, the duties and the responsibilities of the Aaronic priesthood, as applying to the officers of the Christian Church. His opponents are profane and sacrilegious; they have passed sentences of death upon themselves by disobeying the command of the Lord in Deuteronomy, to 'hear the priest;' they have forgotten the injunction of Solomon to honour and reverence God's priests; they have despised the example of St. Paul, who regretted that 'he did not know it was the high priest;' they have been guilty of the sin of Korah, Dathan and Abiram. These passages are urged again and again. They are urged, moreover, as applying not by parity of reasoning, not by analogy of circumstance, but as absolute, and immediate, and unquestionable. As Cyprian crowned the edifice of episcopal

power, so also was he the first to put forth without relief or disguise these sacerdotal assumptions; and so uncompromising was the tone in which he asserted them, that nothing was left to his successors but to enforce his principles, and reiterate his language."

St. Cyprian treatise "on the Lapsed," i.e., those who in the persecution had denied the Lord will furnish illustrations of many perilous exaggerations or half-truths, which were afterward developed into serious and mischievous corruptions, both of doctrine and discipline. "Think you," he says, "that He will easily have mercy upon you whom you have declared not to be your God? You must pray more eagerly and entreat; you must spend whole days in grief; wear out whole nights in watchings and weepings; occupy all your time in wailful lamentations; lying stretched on the ground you must cling close to the ashes, be surrounded with sackcloth and filth; after losing the raiment of Christ, you must be willing now to have no clothing; after the devil's meat you must prefer fasting; be earnest in righteous works, whereby sins may be purged; frequently apply yourselves to almsgiving, whereby souls are freed from death." And again: "We believe, indeed, that the merits of martyrs and the works of the righteous are of great avail with the Judge; but that will be when the day of judgment shall come—when, after the conclusion of this life and the world, His people shall stand before the tribunal of God."¹

And, again, we find a curious illustration of the feeling of the Church, its high wrought faith, its realization of supernatural power by which it was encompassed on every side, in the following stories, which furnish also illustrations of the current belief, tending too closely to materialism, as to the real change that had been produced in the elements of the Holy Eucharist by their consecration to

¹ Lightfoot, "Philippians," pp. 256-257.

¹ 35. ² 17.

that solemn use. An infant child had been given up by the wet-nurse, in the terror of the persecution, to the magistrates, and a morsel of bread mingled with wine from an idol's sacrifice, had been placed in its mouth. When after the persecution the girl was recovered by her parents and brought by them to the meeting of the Church. "When we were sacrificing," (Cyprian says—by which of course he means celebrating the Holy Eucharist) "when the deacon offered her in her turn, the cup"—for the Eucharist was in that age, administered to little children—"she turned away her face; and when the deacon persisted and forced on her some of the sacrament of the cup, then followed sobbing and vomiting. In a profaned body and mouth the Eucharist could not remain; the draught sanctified in the Blood of the Lord burst forth from the polluted stomach." Again, a woman who had lapsed, having received the Eucharist, "as if taking some deadly poison into her jaws and body, began presently to be tortured, and to become stiffened with frenzy." And another woman, when she tried with unworthy hands to open her box, in which was the holy Body of the Lord, was deterred by fire rising from it from daring to touch it. And when one, who himself was defiled, dared with the rest to receive secretly a part of the sacrifice celebrated by the priest, he could not eat or handle the Body of the Lord, but found in his hands when opened, that he had a cinder." One of these miracles, Cyprian assures us, occurred when he himself was present.

But though we know too well, by the sure verdict of history, to what utter perversion of the gospel and corruption of life not a few of St. Cyprian's incautious doctrines might too easily grow, we must not hold him accountable for more than he did actually himself believe. When we read his letters to the Confessors and his Treatise on the Lapsed, we can understand the need of a godly rigor of discipline; and we may recognize thankfully that it was the piety and courage of such men as Cyprian that saved the Church in her extremest peril.

And at any rate, he laid no burden on others that he was unwilling to bear himself. He knew full well that if the Bishop's place in the Church was first in honor, it was first also in danger. In the first persecution under Valerian, Cyprian was banished. It seemed to be the object of the Emperor to repress Christianity, if it might be possible, without bloodshed—and he hoped especially to accomplish his purpose by the complete separation of the Bishops from their flocks. But spiritual ties could by no earthly power be sundered, and sterner measures became necessary if Christianity was indeed to be destroyed. Bishop and clergy, even women and children, were scourged, and condemned to imprisonment or to labor in the mines. Cyprian was active from his place of banishment, in ministering both to their bodily and spiritual wants. He sent them large sums of money taken both from his own income, and from the treasury of the Church. In his letters to the sufferers we find the simple utterance of an affectionate piety in the light of which we may judge most truly both his doctrine and the rigour of his ecclesiastical discipline. "In the mines," he says, "the body is refreshed, not by beds and pillows, but by the comforts and joys of Christ. Your limbs, wearied with labor, recline upon the earth; but with Christ it is no punishment to lie there. If the outer man is defiled the inner man is but the more purified by the spirit that is from above. Your bread is scanty, but man lives not by bread alone, but by every word of God. You are in want of clothing to defend you from the cold; but he who has put on Christ is provided with clothing and ornament enough. Even in the fact, my beloved brethren, that you cannot now celebrate the Communion of the Lord's Supper, your faith may still be conscious of no want. You celebrate the most glorious communion; you present God the costliest offering, since the Holy Scriptures declare that to God, the most acceptable sacrifice is a broken and a contrite heart. You present yourselves to God as a pure and holy offering."

To the clergy he writes: "Your example has been followed by a large portion of the Church, who have confessed and been crowned with you. United to you by ties of the strongest love, they would not be separated from their shepherds by dungeons and mines. Even young maidens and boys are with you. What power do you now possess of a victorious conscience; what triumph in your hearts; when you can walk through the mines with imprisoned body, but a heart conscious of the mastery over itself; when you know that Christ is with you, rejoicing over the patience of his servants, who, in His own footsteps and by His own way, are entering into the kingdom of eternity."

At last the edict appeared that "Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons, were to be put to death immediately by the sword." On the fourteenth of September, A.D., 258, when the fatal sentence was pronounced upon *him*, the last words of Cyprian were, "God be thanked!"

I have given here not even an adequate sketch of the life, and writings, and work of this illustrious Bishop and Martyr; but I shall have accomplished some part of my purpose, if I have enabled the reader more clearly to realize what in the middle of the third century, the Church of Christ really was. Cyprian neither claims for himself nor does anybody else claim for him, either infallibility or supreme authority. His private opinions deserve, indeed, the highest respect and the most careful consideration. As private opinions, however, they were all liable to revision, and not a few of them have been set aside. As an interpreter of Scripture, he is often eccentric and extravagant, and his conclusions both practical and theoretical, are not seldom of much greater value than the arguments by which he supposed them to be proved, as they are, in fact, often independent of them. But whatever we may think of him as a doctor, he is simply invaluable as a witness. He certainly must have known, and unquestionably *did* know what the Church of his day actually was; what was its organization, its mode of government, its doctrines, its dis-

cipline, its traditions, its ritual and ceremonial. He was in constant communication with the Catholic Bishops of the whole world; and he knew perfectly well that he agreed with them in all essentials both of truth and order. He lived and labored in the first half of the third century; and it is incredible that the Church, as St. Cyprian knew her, should have been altogether different from the Church which had been founded and organized by the Apostles. If *they* had received from our Lord the necessary instruction and the necessary authority for building up the Church, then the Church as we find her in the letters and treatises of St. Cyprian, was possessed of a divine wisdom and a divine authority. And hence, it must follow that we can only satisfy ourselves that we belong to that same Church, Catholic and eternal, if we also have the same order, the same creed, the same sacraments as those of which St. Cyprian tells us. "For Christianity," to borrow the words of Dr. Newman, "has been long enough in the world to justify us in dealing with it as a fact in the world's history. Its genius and character, its doctrines, precepts and objects cannot be treated as matters of private opinion or deduction, unless we may reasonably so regard the Spartan institutions or the religion of Mahomet. It may, indeed, legitimately be made the subject-matter of theories; what is its moral and political excellence, what its due location in the range of ideas or of facts which we possess; whether it be divine or human, whether original or eclectic, or both at once; how far favorable to civilization or to literature; whether a religion for all ages or for a particular state of society; these are questions upon the fact, or professed solution of the fact, and belong to the province of opinion; but to a fact do they relate, on an admitted fact do they turn, which must be ascertained as other facts, and surely has on the whole been so ascertained, unless the testimony of so many centuries is to go for nothing. Christianity is no dream of the study or the cloister. It has long since passed beyond the letter of documents and the reason-

ings of individual minds, and has become public property. Its 'sound has gone out into all lands,' and 'its words unto the ends of the world.' It has from the first had an objective existence, and has thrown itself upon the great concourse of men. Its home is in the world; and to know what it is, we must seek it in the world, and hear the world's witness of it."

If then St. Cyprian could leave for awhile his heavenly glory and come down to visit us in this country, where, if anywhere, would he find that Church for which more than fifteen hundred years ago he lived and died? He would find, indeed, a world utterly changed, a society saturated with those truths which fifteen hundred years ago were the carefully guarded treasures of the elect few. He would hear of no persecutions, and therefore of no "lapsed." He would scarcely meet with an individual who did not profess himself a Christian, and believe himself a member of a Christian Church; and yet we can scarcely doubt that he would be sorely baffled when he discovered that there was in this country not *one* Church of Christ, but nominally, at least, *very many* churches. He would discover with amazement, and not, we may imagine without holy indignation that these various so-called Churches were not only *independent* but *rival* communities. Where would he be likely to find the divine family, among whose children he would be at home as of old? Would he recognize the Catholic Church in those small but select assemblies of cultivated and comfortable ladies and gentlemen, whose chief bond of Christian union is a denial of the divinity of our Lord, and of the redeeming efficacy of the sacrifice on the cross? Would he find the Catholic Church among those good people, who have learned to dispense with Bishops and to repudiate Episcopacy? Would he recognize a Christian Church that was without a priesthood, without an altar, without a sacrifice? Would he find himself at home among those who deny baptism to children? Would he be able to join with any

feeling of security or comfort in divine offices protected by no august liturgy or authorized ritual? We may be perfectly certain that nowhere, thus far, would he who was Bishop of Carthage in the first half of the third century, recognize the Catholic Church.

But he would hear, at any rate, of one body with bishops and priests, altars and sacrifice, august liturgy and authorized ritual, claiming himself, moreover, as one of their most revered fathers, and naming his name with solemn commemoration at every mass. He would find this body, moreover, claiming as peculiarly its own, and receiving even from its bitterest enemies the name *Catholic*. He would find its members in communion with a hundred and fifty millions of Christians throughout the whole world. But how does it come to pass, we may surely suppose him asking, that there is about these Christian people and their sacred services, an air so foreign? How does it come to pass that they do not use, in the divine service the language of the people, the language moreover, which to the majority of their own priests is their mother tongue? The very familiarity of his own Latin would amaze, and one may fancy, *appall* this visitor to a new world. *Latin*, we may imagine the great champion of Episcopal independence, the sturdy opponent of the Roman Stephen, murmuring to himself, *Latin!* Can it be possible that that little seed of tyranny has grown into so gigantic a tree! Is it possible that the despotism of Rome can be overshadowing this vast continent, which seems to me like a new created world! Who is your Bishop? he might ask, as he joined the crowds on their way from some high festival in the cathedral of ——. Who is your Metropolitan? Who your Patriarch? and how does it come to pass, he might enquire further, that you hold no communion with those other Christian people, who boast that they also are Catholics, who have their own bishops, their own synod, their own priests and altars and sacrifice, who rehearse the ancient and orthodox creeds, and whose liturgy, in all

essentials, is exactly like my own? What answer would be the only answer which sooner or later he must receive to questions such as these? He would, of course, be told that the separation was the result of all kinds of heresies; and he would be in no degree re-assured by discovering that these so-called heresies were for the most part, denials of doctrines of which he himself had lived and died in total ignorance. He would discover with amazement and horror that whole nations had been anathematized for the rejection of dogmas, which, in the Catholic Church of the first three centuries were utterly unknown. But sooner or later, he would discover the very head and front of the offending. He would find that the ghastly schism is the result, not of disputes about doctrine, but of a dispute about jurisdiction; the doctrinal differences, indeed, are many and serious; as they stand, they are *almost* fatal; but if they could come to terms about jurisdiction, they need not even yet be utterly desperate. In the hearts of vast multitudes there is a hungry longing for unity, combined with a manly reverence for the See of St. Peter and a grateful recognition of the innumerable and invaluable services that have been rendered to Christendom by the august Patriarchate of the West. But the demand for absolute supremacy, coupled with a claim of official infallibility, implies a total revolution and inversion of Catholic Church order. It annihilates the authority of Œcumenical Councils in the past as well as for all time to come. It abolishes tradition as really and as completely as it supersedes Holy Scripture. It embodies that most comprehensive form of despotism which it is possible even to conceive—the union in one person of all legislative, judicial and executive functions. It destroys every safeguard for the permanence of the Christian religion; and lays the whole Church gagged and fettered at the feet of a single Pontiff.

But if St. Cyprian must turn away with terror and amazement from so comprehensive and so un-catholic a despotism, would he find himself at home among ourselves?

Assuredly even here there would be much to surprise and even to alarm him. He would miss in our sacred service many a venerable symbol which for him had been expressive of divine meanings. He would wonder at the coldness of our commemorations, and might not unreasonably fear that we had forgotten at least that Communion of Saints which binds together in one glorious brotherhood the Church on earth and the Church in heaven. He would marvel at our easy toleration of false doctrine and self-willed insubordination. He would be surprised at the facility with which our own communicants can ignore or explain away the central truths and holiest mysteries of their own creed and worship. He would be startled by the freedom with which the ordinances and doctrines of the Church are everywhere handled. He would find it difficult to understand why so many of us seem to attach a greater importance to our accidental Protestantism than to our essential Catholicity. But we could explain our position by long chapters of a varied history which fifteen hundred years ago he would have deemed impossible. And we may well believe that he would approve our Christian prudence in sacrificing for the sake of the pure gospel and apostolic discipline of Christ's Church, not a little of what at first was so useful that it seemed almost necessary; not a little of what is always so fascinating that it might lure to destruction, if it were possible, even God's elect.

WILLIAM KIRKUS.

1881.—MOTHER SHIPTON'S PROPHECY.

In twice two hundred years, the Bear
The Crescent shall assail,
But if the Cock and Bull unite,
The Bear shall not prevail;
But look in twice ten years again,
Let Islam know and fear,
The Cross shall wax, the Crescent wane,
Grow pale and disappear.

Gold shall be found and grown,
In a land that's not yet known;
And in the twinkling of an eye,
Around the world our thoughts shall fly.

Fire and water shall wonders do,
England at last shall admit the Jew.
The world to an end shall come,
In eighteen hundred and eighty-one.²

All ages and countries have had their seers, prophets, wise men, magicians, augurs and sybillæ. We hear of such characters and professors among the Egyptians in the time of Moses; men so skilled in their occult sciences and legerdemain as almost to rival the wonder-worker of the Hebrews. "And Aaron cast down his rod before Pharaoh and before his servants, and it became a serpent. Then Pharaoh also called the wise men and the sorcerers: Now the magicians of Egypt they also did in like manner with their enchantments. For they cast down every man his

¹ Then Saul said unto his servants, seek me a woman that hath a familiar spirit, that I may go to her and inquire of her. And his servants said to him, Behold there is a woman that hath a familiar spirit at Endor. I Samuel, xxviii: 7.

² See note at the end of this article.

rod, and they became serpents: But Aaron's rod swallowed up their rods." And so with regard to other of the signs and wonders wrought by Moses; the magicians did so with their enchantments.

Further along in the history of the Jewish people comes the curious, interesting and highly poetical episode of Balaam. Nothing more gorgeously eastern in all its appointments and surroundings can be found anywhere in history, poetry, or fiction. A splendid embassy of the first men of the kingdom of Moab, make a journey to this heathen seer and magician, dwelling in the far east, in the highlands of the upper Euphrates, bearing in their hands the rewards of divination, and begging him to return with them, and to use the utmost of his enchantments against the strange people who had just emerged from the wilderness, and promising him, in addition, high promotion and great honor and riches. Overcoming doubt and difficulty and opposition he undertakes the mission. And when he comes with the princes of Moab, the king himself makes a journey to the utmost coast of Moab, to meet him, and conducts him with great pomp and ceremony to the capital. He accompanies him on the next day to the chief place of the worship of Baal, whence the greatest part of the Israelitish encampment could be seen, and carries into prompt execution the command of Balaam, to erect there seven altars and to prepare seven oxen and seven rams. And this magical number was repeated at every new sacrificial offer. But the seer was not permitted to *curse* Israel. Although his zeal was stimulated by the promise of untold riches, of unlimited honors, of being the keeper of the king's conscience; yet all his arts of divination were of no avail. "Surely," cried the baffled magician, "Surely there is no enchantment against Jacob, neither is there any divination against Israel:" and he then proceeds by Divine permission, to *prophecy* concerning the strange people in a strain of eloquence and sublimity unsurpassed.

From this unknown and shadowy country, "the East,"

came the first people, from the east came the builder of the great Pyramid, from the east came the three wise men to the Babe at Bethlehem, and from the east, by the almost universal judgment of the Church, will be the second coming of Christ; for which reason early Christians turned in that direction to worship, built the sanctuary and altar at the eastern end of the church, and in the celebration of the Holy Communion, the celebrant faced the east in the consecration of the elements.

If we refer to the literature of the Greeks and Romans, we find their history and poetry full of the sayings and doings of their augurs and soothsayers and sybillæ; and we find that those hopes and desires to look into the future, and the imaginings that by some means, glimpses of coming events may be had, were not confined to early ages and eastern people.

Germany is full of popular prophecies—some of them so minute and specific in their details of events, and in the description of the places where they are to happen, as to challenge doubt of their authenticity.

The second sight among the Scottish highlanders—a power which comes sometimes by divination, and sometimes in a trance; whose remarkable traditional fulfilments are also the subjects of romance, poetry and song—is still believed in and practised among the people of the districts, where for ages it has been known and remarked.

Nor from this brief mention of seers and soothsayers should the notable name of Nostradamus be omitted. His "Centuries of Predictions" have occasioned more discussion and controversy, than even the Sybilline leaves, whose volumes were offered for a great price to Tarquinius the Second.

We find too, that Mother Shipton does not stand alone among the English in the claim to look into futurity. They have also Merlin, the Magician; Michael Scott, the Sorcerer; and Friar Bacon, the Student; and around them and their utterances the glamor of antiquity, the glow of

poetry, and the indistinct revelation which piques the curiosity. Some of Mother Shipton's prophecies are alleged to have been delivered as early as 1448 ; but the popular histories of her are unworthy of belief. She was born, or at least lived at Knaresborough, in Yorkshire, England, before or in the reign of Henry VII, who came to the throne in 1485. At all events, many of the predictions, in one form or another are old, although the age is disputed, as well as the authorship. For the purposes of this article, however, we take them as we find them, assuming them to be old and genuine, and to have been spoken by Mother Shipton.

How can we who read in the Books of Moses of the Egyptian Magicians, and of Balaam the seer, divest our minds entirely of the impression, that a glance into the future may have been given to others than the Hebrew Prophets? Certainly there have been persons to whom have come the spirits, good or bad, demon or angel, and impressed their subjects or victims with knowledge not their own, and from a quarter whence they knew not. They see visions and they dream dreams, but they cannot tell the interpretation thereof, nor give form and consistency to the shadows that pass before their entranced eyes.

Is not this belief in the supernatural and in the power to foretell future events, a natural retention in our mental and moral organism, of the time when the Creator and other heavenly intelligences appeared on the earth and talked to men, and revealed personally to them, that which should be thereafter? Could any such belief be so universal, among the untutored and unlearned if it did not arise from an element in our nature, deeper than our own consciousness? It is all very well to argue against it, and to prove by the undisputed rules of logic that such things cannot be ; but belief does not follow such demonstration, and rules of reasoning are powerless against a belief for which no reason can be given. "The days of

prophecy are past," say the orthodox. "There never were any days of prophecy," say the sceptical; and they agree, that the inexorable logic of events is the only guide to conclusions as to what is to be—so far at least as the supposed unfulfilled prophecies of the Hebrew Scriptures do not control. But the history of the world is not to be so ignored—no man may say that the veil of the future shall never more be lifted, and that nothing more shall be known until the end of all sublunary things—especially in view of the fact that much has been revealed, and that the government of the universe seemingly remains the same. These things challenge the attention of the thoughtful, and are worthy the consideration of the student of history, of philosophy, and of the generally received revelation.

Now let us take up this prophecy of Mother Shipton, and see, on a fair and honest and reasonable construction of the words, what it is that they indicate.

The Turks came into Europe in the thirteenth century, but it is to be remarked that it was not until the year 1453, that Mohammed II, stormed Constantinople, and permanently established Islamism in Europe as a national and military and ecclesiastical power. And it was about that same year, that this prophecy was delivered. Now "twice two hundred years" brings us to 1853, and the Crimean war, as it was called, was entered upon by Russia, "the Bear," in 1853—in 1854 England and France, "the Cock" and "the Bull" united; and in 1856 the peace of Paris was signed, "the Bear" not having prevailed. If Mother Shipton had written her lines after this war, they could not have been made to correspond more exactly with the historical facts. In 1853 the dread of Russian supremacy, the jealousy of interference with English interests in the east, and national pride were the incentives moving England to engage in that war. The same dread and jealousy and pride were not one whit less in 1876 than in 1853, and were urged most vehemently by one party in England, as a reason for armed intervention for Turkey in the last war

and yet, most mysteriously, "the Bull" and "the Cock" held aloof from the contest, and when the peace of Berlin was signed, it was no longer an open question that the power of Turkey, as a nation in Europe, was utterly destroyed.

From 1856, the peace of Paris, to the breaking out of the late war between Russia and Turkey was just "twice ten years." It is to be observed also concerning the war in the Crimea, that not one word was ever said about the "Cross," or the "Crescent;" but it is a matter of history, that this last war between the same powers was begun, urged, and waged for the protection and defence of Christians from the rapacity and cruelty of the Moslems. So the two portions of this prophecy are just as distinct and specific as the past history of the transactions shows that they ought to be. History and prophecy agree that the first war was a war between *nations*; and history and prophecy equally agree that this last was a war between and on account of *religions*.

The Cross shall wax, the Crescent wane,
Grow pale and disappear.

Call this prediction what you please, the history of the world may be challenged to point out a more exact and remarkable correspondence between the march of events and the prophecy concerning them. The nations and times and the objects of the wars as well as the results are particularly set forth; and no man who reads the history can pretend to misapprehend them. If there was nothing more than this, Mother Shipton's prediction would challenge the attention of students of history; and it would also invite inquiry into that mental condition which now, after the date of the end of what has been called the era of prophecy, could thus receive and put upon record centuries ago, a series of statements which the march of time has discovered to the world, as lately accomplished facts.

The prophecy further declares as we have it now—

Gold shall be found and grown,
In a land that's not yet known.

Columbus discovered America in 1492, but the statement would doubtless be true though made after that event, for the land was hardly known in any sense. Did the eye of the seer peer through the mists of the stormy Atlantic, and discover this vast continent? And into the bowels of the earth and see the glitter of the gold, which was not discovered even by ourselves, until the year 1847, four hundred years after the words were spoken, and nearly so many after the discovery of the continent? Or even if Australia should be supposed to have been referred to, the remark is equally true, for Australia was not known before 1550 and more than likely not earlier than 1600; and the discovery of gold there was not until the year 1851. And in both cases the production was in such immense quantities as to awaken the wonder of the world. Whence could have come so exact a knowledge? Covering in two lines two such facts, agreeing precisely with the prediction.

Fire and water shall wonders do :

This can have reference only to the steam engine in its application to navigation, locomotion and manufactures. And however, philosophers and mechanics and inventors may have thought and written upon the subject, no pretence can be made of any application of steam to use before 1600, and nothing tangible before the claims of Jonathan Hulls in 1736. It is true that Roger Bacon as early at least as 1292, is supposed to have discoursed of the uses of steam, but nothing seems to have come from his lucubrations.

So in regard to the prediction made concerning the electric telegraph. That "in the twinkling of an eye, around the world our thoughts shall fly," is an accomplished fact; and yet it is but a few years since the laying of the Atlantic Cable was among the wonders of the

century. That scientists should have guessed as much, might not be so astounding, but coming as it is claimed to have come, it is unaccountable.

We pass these things, however, and proceed to discuss two other matters, more curious and more important.

England at last shall admit a Jew.

It is impossible to give even an epitome of the horrible persecution to which the Jews were subjected during the first fifteen hundred years of the Christian era. In this more enlightened and humanized and perhaps Christianized age, the cruelties are almost beyond belief, and would certainly not be credited were they not attested by sober history. During the early years of our era the Roman emperors seemed determined to annihilate them, and about A.D., 135, the whole of Judea was made like a desert. A thousand towns and villages lay in as es, and Jerusalem itself was settled by a heathen colony, from which the Jews were strictly debarred. They were dispersed over the world, and for a couple of centuries, were, in their poverty and obscurity, comparatively unmolested. They began in the mean time to flourish in trade and commerce, they became merchants, artizans and bankers, as well as husbandmen and shepherds. They were scholars, poets and professors in schools of learning; and in the community, quiet, unassuming and industrious citizens. But growing in wealth and importance the ecclesiastical and civil law was invoked against them. Various restrictions were put upon them, enormous taxes were assessed against them, certain callings and occupations were forbidden them, they were excluded from the military service, they were not allowed to bear arms nor defend themselves, and in various ways were subjected to frightful persecutions. In no country could they even live except by the payment of great pecuniary amercements. In some, especially in France, their whole estates were more than once confiscated, their evidences of indebtedness forced from

them, their goods seized, and they themselves, thus stripped of everything, banished the kingdom. Having been allowed to return to France, there was in 1321, a most horrible massacre inflicted upon them. In their agony, Jewish fathers and mothers threw their children to the Christian mob to appease their devilish fury, and in vain. On the breaking out of the plague in the following year, the wildest crimes were laid to their charge, and in whole provinces every Jew was burned. At Chinon a deep ditch was dug, an enormous pile was raised, and one hundred and sixty of both sexes burned together.

They appeared in England at an early period and they were pelted and plundered and persecuted. In 1189, because some of them came to witness the coronation of King Richard of the Lion Heart, they were attacked by the mob, their houses pillaged and burned, and themselves murdered; and in York, where it was proposed to force them to Christian baptism, they preferred voluntary martyrdom. Persecution and plunder, exclusion from trades and callings, refusal of others to deal with them, and fines and imprisonments made life intolerable; and in 1253 they begged of their own accord to be allowed to leave the kingdom. They were persuaded to remain, for they had wealth and they were industrious; but in 1290 they were driven from the shores of England and pursued by the execrations of the infuriate rabble, even after they had left in the hands of the king all their property, accounts, obligations and mortgages. Time and space are not at my command, so as to enable me to follow them through Spain and Holland and Germany, and recount the persecutions and murders and plunderings to which they were subjected. It is horrible beyond description, and almost beyond the imagination to conceive, and it shows the condition of the universal Gentile mind in reference to them.

The decree of Edward I, by which they were banished from England in 1290, remained in force for more than three hundred years, and it was while they were under the

ban of that decree, that the prediction now under consideration was made. When to all human foresight no such thing was possible, when no Jew dared put his foot into England, when king, lords and commons were all supporting the persecution of the hated race, we are told that at last, England shall admit a Jew. But it was not until the reign of Charles II, more than two hundred years after the utterance of the prophecy, that they were permitted to return. In 1723 they acquired the right to possess land, in 1753 they obtained the right of naturalization. But it was nearly a hundred years later before they were allowed to become members of civic corporations, then shortly after advocates. In 1845 they could hold the office of alderman and lord mayor; in 1858 they were admitted to parliament, and in 1868, Mr. Disraeli, a Jew by descent, was made Prime Minister of England. A little more than four hundred years had elapsed since the prediction, and England not only admitted the hated and persecuted and banished Jew, but a Jew guided the destinies of that England, in which six hundred years before, he dared not even to reside.

And it is not among the least curious of these historical facts, that the clause of this prophecy relating to the religious element of it, should begin and end during the premiership of this same Jew. That the "Cross" under his management of the foreign policy of England should rise over the "Crescent," and that England should be restrained under his leadership, from carrying out her long maintained eastern policy—especially in favor of the only nation which had the power, the independence and the will to protect his race, during the times of persecution. Nor is it beyond the consideration of this question, to remember that many English statesmen consider the policy of Mr. Disraeli most inimical to the welfare of England, that they believe the peace of Berlin to be but a sowing of the dragon's teeth, and that all the pomp and parade of ministers will be but dust and ashes. Would it not be a stern historical compensation if the wind sown by England

should return a whirlwind out of the hand of this Jew? Look at the political and social condition of the nations which for long years plundered and persecuted and butchered his race; see the position in which this peace of Berlin has placed them; hark to the thunderings of new wars in various parts of the empire of Great Britain, which already load the breeze; consider the difficulty in carrying out the provisions of this patched up peace, the responsibility assumed by England in her new role of guardian; and then consider all these complications as the work of the Jew, of one of the chosen race whose national existence is assured from generation to generation, whose national restoration is solemnly promised, and through whose instrumentality all the great changes in the government of the world have been wrought; and then consider the closing lines:

The world to an end shall come,
In eighteen hundred and eighty one.

A long line of prophetic teaching, the secular history of the world, and the universal expectation of mankind awaited in profound anxiety the change in the moral government of the people of our earth, when the birth of the Saviour of the world occurred, in the year of the creation, 4004. What great leader or deliverer was to appear, what were to be his character and attributes, in what city, nation or quarter of the world he was to arise, were, among the great body of expectant people, surmise and mere conjecture. But it was a curious fact that oppressed people everywhere looked for the Coming Man to be their deliverer from whatsoever thralldom bore most heavily upon them. He was to lighten the public burdens. He was to let the oppressed go free. He was to establish a universal kingdom, and the splendor of his reign was to be incomparable. Virgil is thought to have had in his mind this great expectation in his Fourth Eclogue; and to have applied the words of the Cumæan Sibyl, spoken in reference

to the expected leader, to the child about to be born of Octavia the sister of Cæsar, the widow of Marcellus and at the birth of the child, wife of Antony.

And whatsoever we may say as to the application of the prediction of the Sibyl, or of the verses of Virgil, the prediction had most certainly been made long before; for the Eclogues of Virgil were written, published and recited on the stage, between thirty and forty years before the birth of Christ. It has never been pretended that the Cumæan Sibyl had any knowledge of the Hebrew Scriptures, or had ever heard of them, and it is almost equally certain that Virgil had no acquaintance with them. And for the purposes of this argument it is sufficient to show, that Virgil, forty years before the event, voiced in immortal verse the universal looking forward of all mankind to the birth or appearance of a Deliverer who should be more than human in all his attributes and of divine descent. Even Virgil must give way to the splendidly inspired imagery of Isaiah, but with that in our mind, how can we do less than wonder at the predictions of the Sybil or of the Roman poet:

The years approach, by Sibyl sage foretold,
Again by circling time in order rolled;
Astrea comes, old Saturn's holy reign,
Peace, virtue, justice, now return again.
See a new progeny from heaven descend!
Lucina hear! the important birth befriend!
The golden age this infant shall restore
Thy Phoebus reigns—and vice shall be no more.

* * * *

For thee, O child, spontaneous earth shall pour
Green ivy, mixed with every choicest flower,
Each field shall breathe Assyria's rich perfume,
And sweets ambrosial round thy cradle bloom,
With milk o'er charged the goats shall homeward speed,
And herds secure from mighty lions feed.
The baleful asp and speckled snake shall die,

* * * *

The Sisters to their spindles said—'Succeed
Ye happy years, for thus hath Fate decreed!

Assume thy state! thy destined honors prove
Dear to the gods! O progeny of Jove!
Behold how tottering nature nods around,
Earth, air, the watery waste, and heaven profound!
At once they change—they wear a smiling face
And all with joy th' approaching age embrace!

So spake the Sibyl interpreted by the poet, and the Jew and the Gentile, in the several lights accorded to them, awaited the event. We should not perhaps lose sight of the fact that Cumæ was a Greek colony, nor of the further fact that more than two hundred years before the birth of Christ some Egyptian Jews had made the translation of the Scriptures, known as the Septuagint. There could have been however, at that early age, no general knowledge of them, seeing that there was only the slow process of copying by hand, without much aptitude for writing, or many conveniences, such as we have now in pens, ink and paper; and added to that the general inability to read what had been written.

But not only had the Jew and the Greek, the Roman and the Egyptian a looking forward to a Deliverer, by a birth more than human if not quite divine; but in the East, from the deserts of Arabia, and perhaps still beyond, in a more mythical east, of which we know absolutely nothing, except that wherever it was, even there they were watching and waiting. And these wise men, magicians, or seers from this far off and unknown land, saw "his star in the east," and came to worship. Who told them to watch for a star, and what sort of star was to be the sign of his coming? Nowhere in the Hebrew Scriptures is there any hint of this sort given, unless the allusion to a star coming out of Jacob, be so held—no rising star heralded to the Jew the coming sacred birth; no prophets had foretold it, further than that the event was to happen in "the fulness of time." Whence then had these Eastern Magi this learning? They were so sure it was "His Star," that not only was the long journey undertaken, but they provided themselves with gold, frankincense and myrrh for worship and for gifts.

We see therefore, that from the days when Moses encountered the magicians of Egypt, and Balaam attempted his enchantments against Israel, and the Cumæan Sibyl wrote her predictions upon the forest leaves; to the days when wise-men, Magi, came from "the east" by the guiding of a star, known to no others, there have been some persons, outside the line of chosen and commissioned prophets, to whom have been vouchsafed glimpses of coming events and the possession of preternatural power. Bearing these things in mind, and also the literal exactness with which Mother Shipton's predictions have been fulfilled, we are prepared to pay deep consideration to her most momentous outgiving.

As it was two thousand years ago, so to-day, the world is waiting and watching in anxious uncertainty. There is a universal feeling that a change is impending. Not as before, when there was the hope of a Deliverer—but there is now rather a fearful looking forward to judgment. Writers on, and students of the prophecies of the Hebrew Scriptures agree that we are approaching the end of all prophetic revelations. It is, as many estimate the time, the year of the world 6006, the end of the sixth millennium.

The well-known tradition among the Jews, and which was almost universally held among the early Christians, that the Messiah was to come at the end of the sixth millennium, has never lost its hold upon the human mind. Whether it was a sweet reminiscence from the Garden of Eden, learned by him who had talked face to face with the Lord, and handed down through the patriarchs; or whether it was only an inference drawn from the six days of creative work and the rest on the seventh, it is impossible to tell; but the fact remains. The key of the prophecies has not been put into our hands; the time the Father hath kept in His own power. But there are indications of the end, unconsciously provided by those who most strenuously deny the truth of the Scriptures, and the generally received theory of the moral government of the world. As for example;

1.—“The advanced thought of the day” is saying openly, what the fool said only in his heart—“There is no God.”

2.—The Biblical account of the solar system, of the making and formation of the world, of the creation of man, and of his departure hence, are attacked with every weapon known to the scientist, falsely so called.

3.—The *guess* of the creature is set up against the *word* of the Creator.

4.—There are corruption and venality in high places—the governments of the world are in the hands of the money changers—the greed for gold has infected the statesman and the churchman, and has made the patriot a mere politician.

5.—Men are in high places in the church, whose views and opinions are in no wise in accord with the orthodox fathers and the teachings of the Bible.

6.—Christianity is now the fashion, and the World, the Flesh and the Devil are its patrons and supporters and corrupters.

All these are apocalyptic indices of the end. But what that ending shall be, and of what it is the beginning, no man can know.

So too we are nearing the third cycle of two thousand years. At the end of the *First* came the call of Abraham, at the end of the *Second* the birth of Messiah, and now at the end of the *Third* what shall be the coming?

The twelve hundred and sixty years of Mohammedan power, dating from the Hegira of the prophet, will come to a close in eighteen hundred and eighty-one—the inches of years in the royal chamber of the great Pyramid are almost told off—the years of the weeks of the prophet Daniel are drawing to a close—the constellation *Dracon* is hastening in the grand march of the heavenly bodies, to its place beneath the feet of *Aries*.

But in an especial manner also the number 9, the number of Fatherhood and of Judgment enters into all the mathe-

matical constructions of eighteen hundred and eighty-one. Although not in itself a perfect number, yet it contains more curious properties than any other. The figures which compose its multiples, if added together are alway a multiple of 9. And any number large or small, if multiplied by 9, will give a result which when the digits composing it are added together until they are reduced to one, that one will be 9. For example: $47 \times 9 = 4 + 2 + 3 = 9$. Or $765 \times 9 = 6 + 8 + 8 + 5 = 2 + 7$. Or $450 \times 9 = 4 + 0 + 5 + 0 = 9$. Or a multiple $450 \times 3 = 1 + 3 + 5 + 0 = 9$. "So" says an acute writer, "it is a number of finality and of judgment. It is also the number of MAN, man being the last and most perfect of God's works, and judgment his peculiar attribute. Multiplied by the 5 of the covenant it is 45, the number of Adam; which if again multiplied by 10 becomes 450, the grand chronological term of the Patriarchs, Judges, Prophets, Kings and Scribes. It is a factor of all the great dates of judgment, namely, of the Flood, the Doom of Sodom, the Overthrow of Pharaoh, the Captivity, and the Final Desolation."

If we take 1881 it divides by 9 without a remainder—the first two figures and the last two divide by 9 without a remainder. If we add the first two figures the sum is 9, if we add the last two the sum is 9—and finally the two sums together are 99, which is the sum of our Lord's solemn "Amen!"

JOHN G. FREEZE.

NOTE.

We have printed this Article as being interesting in itself. It is right, however, to inform our readers that there is little doubt that the lines affixed as having been written by Mother Shipton, are very different from the original prophecy. The following extract from an editorial in the New York "Journal of Commerce" will show this:

Mother Shipton was a veritable character who lived more than three hundred years ago, and uttered a number of so-called prophecies. They were,

for the most part, a vague, unmeaning jumble of seeming predictions applicable to no special event, and without point or general interest. In 1641 a pamphlet containing a medley of this sort, chiefly in halting verse, was printed in London, and her "Life and Curious Prophecies" were given to the public in 1677.

In 1862 Mr. Charles Hindley, of Brighton, England, issued what purported to be an exact reprint of "A Chap-book version" of Mother Shipton's prophecies, from "the edition of 1448." In this, for the first time, there were point and pith, and special application. All modern discoveries were plainly described, and one prophecy which began

"Carriages without horses shall go."

and set forth the railroads, telegraphs, steamers and other modern inventions, wound up with

"The world to an end shall come
In eighteen hundred and eighty-one"

This, of course, quite startled the public. If all other important events of the nineteenth century had been so aptly described, why should not the last prediction be fulfilled? We copied the prophecy, and without knowing anything of its source, denounced it as a forgery. An English paper replied that it was an exact reprint of the old edition for nearly two hundred and fifty years on file in the British Museum. We sent our correspondent to the Museum and learned that there was a chap-book of that title bearing date 1641; another of 1642, containing what purported to be Mother Shipton's portrait; other curious prophecies dated 1648, 1662, 1667; and "Mother Shipton's Life and Curious Prophecies" complete in an octavo edition of 1797. We then purchased the reprint and sent to have them compared. This proved that a fraud had been committed. The old prophecies were a vague jumble of local predictions that might have been fulfilled at any and every decade since their date. All the pointed and interesting predictions in the new issue were not in the old book, and were either interlineations, interpolations, or entirely new fragments, evidently written after the events they were supposed to predict. We pressed the point, and the secret then came out. In the spring of 1873, Mr. Hindley wrote a letter confessing that he had fabricated the prophecy above quoted and ten others, in order to render his little book salable. He had started in good faith to reprint the old chap-book, but finding nothing in it applicable to modern times, he had set his own wits at work to supply the omission. We have given this at some length, as portions of these literary forgeries are still going the rounds of the press as veritable antiques.

NEW YORK, February 13, 1880.

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT.

We invite special attention to the first article in this number of the *Review*, on the Ritual Law in the American Church. It is written by one who has given much study and thought to the subject, and it deserves careful consideration. The broad claim is made that all things which are not forbidden in the Liturgy are permitted. We suppose, of course, that this means only things allowed in the English Church before the Reformation. Without some such limitation the claim would be too absurd. This is the assertion taken up, examined, and we think refuted, in this article. But if it be allowed, then prayers for the dead, invocations of angels and saints, worship of images, adoration of the elements in the Eucharist and other observances of a like nature, not being positively forbidden by the Rubrics, may be introduced. As it is, great diversity in conducting the service is obtaining among us; so that the old boast that a churchman feels at home in our Churches, wherever he may be, from Maine to Texas, no longer holds good. There are those who think this uniformity to be a matter of little consequence. We, on the contrary, think it has been one great cause of the growth of the Church in this country. Among the changing sects around men have come to feel the beauty of stability: they are tired of being "tossed about by every wind of Doctrine;" and they have turned to the Church because she was fixed in her faith and worship; because they knew what they had to expect; because they were protected from constant change; were not at the mercy of every shifting opinion and fancy of the minister. In a word, they sought the Church to get rid of *individualism*. But if every young priest is to be the judge of what may be introduced into the service from the old, abandoned ritual, not only is all this fixedness of character lost, but the laity are left to the whim of the minister, and the spirit of individualism, i. e., sectarianism, will prevail in the Church. The General Convention owes it to the Church to take up this matter and settle it. Let the Dioceses be careful to elect Deputies to the Convention meeting next Fall, who will not be afraid to face squarely and settle fully this question of Ritual Law.

AMONG THE BOOKS.

THE MILITARY RELIGIOUS ORDERS OF THE MIDDLE AGES. *By F. C. Woodhouse, M.A., Rector of St. Mary's, Hulme, Manchester.*
LONDON: SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE.
NEW YORK: POTT, YOUNG & Co. pp. 360.

This is one of the series of "The Home Library," another of which, "Great English Churchmen," has been noticed in a previous number of this REVIEW. The Military Religious Orders took a very important part in the defence of Europe and Christianity against the invasions of the Turks and Saracens. We are apt to regard the Crusades as the outcome of a religious fanaticism; and so to a certain extent they were. Yet undoubtedly, in God's Providence, they were the means of keeping back the hordes of Mohammedanism on the soil of Asia for several centuries; and thus they were the salvation of Europe; for it was with difficulty that even as late as the time of the great Emperor Charles V., the tide of Turkish conquest was stayed before the walls of Vienna. What then, humanly speaking, must have been the fate of Europe, if, in its weak condition in the eleventh century, there had been nothing to unite its distracted nations against the common foe. This the Crusades did. The "Religious Military Orders" were a feature, and perhaps we may say a natural outgrowth, of the combination of religion and chivalry which gave power to the Crusades. The first of them originated in the charitable desire to furnish shelter and nursing to the sick pilgrims who visited the Holy Places of Jerusalem; whence the name "Hospitallers." But many men of rank and renown in arms uniting with them, they soon added to this first design, the further purpose of resuming their arms, that they might protect helpless travelers from the Turkomans, and become soldiers of the Cross, vowed to devote their lives to fighting against the enemies of Christ. And thus arose about 1120, the order of the Knights of St. John, or Knights Hospitallers, known in later times as "The Knights of Malta;" and soon after "The Knights Templars," whose organization was wholly military; uniting, however, with this, as did the others, the chief features of the monastic system, by taking the three vows of chastity, poverty and obedience.

The book before us gives a sufficiently full history of the most important of the military orders, those mentioned above, and briefer accounts of others, such as "The Teutonic Knights," the Portuguese, Spanish and English Orders. The story of the celebrated sieges of the Knights of St. John, by the Turks, first in Rhodes and afterwards in Malta, is given with some minuteness, and reads like a page of romance. This order still exists in England, under certain modifications, confining its work, however, to that for which it was first instituted, viz.: the care of the sick. The Templars had a shorter career, the Order being suppressed during the fourteenth century. But traces of their existence are to be found in many places, as in the Temple in London, and in the names of towns throughout England with the word affixed, such as Templestow, Temple Cressing, etc. This book will be found both instructive from the history it contains, and interesting from the pleasant style in which that history is written.

THE MANLINESS OF CHRIST. *By Thomas Hughes, Q.C.* BOSTON: HOUGHTON, OSGOOD AND COMPANY, 1880. pp. 160, \$1.00

Any book by the author of "Tom Brown's School Days at Rugby," is sure to find a plenty of readers. This one deserves to find them. The idea underlying it, and which suggested it, was to set forth wherein true manliness consists; and then exemplify this by the history of our Lord. For as He came to be unto us "an ensample of godly life," we have a right to look unto Him as a pattern of perfection in manliness, as well as in all other things. Here Mr. Hughes has done a good work by drawing clearly the distinction between mere muscular strength with brute courage, and true manliness, and this he gives as the conclusion to which he comes:

Tenacity of will, or willfulness, lies at the root of all courage, but courage can only rise into true manliness when the will is surrendered; and the more absolute the surrender of the will the more perfect will be the temper of our courage and the strength of our manliness.

This principle he then exemplifies by the life of Christ, as manifested in various ways, in His Boyhood, His Call, His Ministry under Three Acts, and His Sufferings and Death. We cannot follow him through these, but assure our readers that they will find many suggestive and profitable thoughts. One doctrine is very clearly brought out, the Human Nature of the Christ, one we, in our desire to magnify the Divine, are somewhat apt to overlook. We know that He was perfect man, as well as perfect God, but unless we fully realize this, we cannot see how "He was in all points tempted like as we are," or how He can be our "ensample." The reputation of Mr. Hughes will cause many

young men to read this, who would not read books of theology, and thus it will do good. We must say a word in praise of the paper and type of this American Edition; they leave nothing to be desired.

CATHARINE AND CRAUFURD TAIT, *Wife and Son of Archibald Campbell, Archbishop of Canterbury. A Memoir edited at the Request of the Archbishop, by the Rev. Wm. Benham, B. D.* LONDON AND NEW YORK: MACMILLAN & Co. pp. 640, \$1.75.

A simple memoir of two earnest Christian lives, written by loving hands, prompted by overflowing hearts. Though not professed biographies, few biographies make us so well acquainted with their subjects as does this book. No one can read it without being the better for it. The lovely picture of a consistent, working Christian, presented in the life of Catharine Tait, cannot fail to impress upon us the power of religion, the reality of the faith she professed. Placed in positions of great responsibility and trial, as wife of one who was successively Head-Master of Rugby, Dean of Carlisle, Bishop of London, Archbishop of Canterbury, in every case she realized and fulfilled the duties incumbent on her. Her strong religious principles sustained her, whether visiting in the palace or in personal ministrations among the poor. Called upon in early married life to mourn the loss of five daughters, taken away in as many weeks, she submitted without a murmur, "as seeing Him who is invisible." Her faith in the "communion of saints" sustained her. And when, in her fifty-ninth year, her only son Craufurd, was taken away in his early manhood, just as a life of usefulness and honor was opening to him, she was able to resign him to a Father's hands with perfect confidence.

The bereaved mother stood for one moment alone when the burial was over, and said, in a low but intensely earnest and thrilling voice, heard only, it is believed, by one young relative, 'I believe in the resurrection of the dead.' Such an expression of faith was in unison with the whole mode of her religious life.

The son was worthy of such a mother. The son of prayer and pious teaching and holy example could not fail to grow up a good man and earnest worker. It is one of the mysteries of God's Providence that such men are often called away just as they enter upon their career of usefulness. How often are we thrown back upon our Lord's words; "What I do, thou knowest not now, but thou shalt know hereafter." Craufurd Tait died in his twenty-ninth year, soon after his return from a visit to this country. Many of our readers will remember seeing him at the General Convention in Boston, in 1877, and recall the favorable impression he there made. A very interesting part of this

memoir is a selection made from his Diary, while travelling through the United States.¹

In reading this book, we have been made to feel strongly, what an influence for good the wife of a clergyman may exert. And when we remember that there are doubtless many mothers of families less prominent in position, but similar in religious character to this one, scattered throughout England, in quiet parsonages, we exclaim, what a blessed thing for England has been her Established Church.

THOUGHTS ON GREAT MYSTERIES. *Selected from the Works of Frederick William Faber, D.D., with an Introduction by J. S. Purdy, D. D.* NEW YORK: THOMAS WHITTAKER, 1880. pp. 229.

F. W. Faber is well-known from his hymns and from his perversion some time ago to Romanism. The object of this volume is to bring before the American reader his prose writings, which, though pervaded by "the most intensely Romish spirit, and the most extravagant of Romish ideas," are yet, the Editor considers, of great "intrinsic worth." Especially because they set forth so strongly the "Scotist" view of Theology, whose starting-point is God and not man. Faber is a poet, and these selections contain many beautiful thoughts, expressed in glowing language. He also sets forth strongly the practical application of his doctrines, in bringing about sanctification. The editor assures us that all Romish ideas have been omitted. Two questions occur in regard to this. First, how far is it honest and fair to an author to omit in a re-publication of even a selection of his works, those portions which he himself would have considered among the most true and important? Second, if a writer's mind is thoroughly pervaded by a certain evil influence, is it possible utterly to eliminate the effects of this from his writings? We think not. Even in this book we can trace a mysticism which is unhealthy, and a reference to Romish traditions, and the use of phrases such as "the Sacred Heart of Jesus;" for which there is no warrant. For our own part, even at the risk of being considered narrow-minded, we must confess a doubt as to the advisability of putting Romish devotional books, even if *ex-purgated*, into the hands of our young people. We are almost inclined to say, if they must read such books, let them have them just as they were written, so that their errors as well as their excellencies may be seen.

¹ There are several not unnatural mistakes in names in this diary, which we suggest to the publishers should be corrected, if another edition, as we hope will be the case, is issued.

THE PASTOR. PASTORAL THEOLOGY. By Rt. Rev. Gregory Thurston Bedell, D.D. PHILADELPHIA: J. B. LIPPINCOTT & Co., 1880. pp. 607. \$1.75.

It is a hopeful sign that our Bishops begin to aid in producing a literature for our Church, especially when it is one founded on their own experience. This is the case with this book, as the motto adopted by the author sets forth: *Experientia docens, docet, docuit*. Such a work is greatly needed, for though there are many volumes of Pastoral Theology, there is not one which can be considered entirely satisfactory. Bishop Bedell's book covers the whole round of the Pastoral office. He begins by stating the pre-requisites for the study. 1. "A theoretical knowledge of Theology." 2. "An experimental knowledge of religion." 3. "A degree of practical knowledge of human nature." Next is set forth "The Source of Clerical Influence;" "Divine Authority," and "Personal Clerical Character." Under the first head we are glad to quote the following: *italics the author's.*

We have no question of the truth of the Divine appointment of our ministry, and that Christ Himself directed the mode of its perpetuation by a tactual succession unbroken from Apostolic days. And inasmuch as it is true, it is to be inculcated. Judiciously taught it will benefit a congregation; and a right application of it will also increase our solemn sense of responsibility to God; and of obligation to be faithful to souls whom he has committed to our care.

Terms are next defined. "Pastoral Theology stands between a knowledge of Divine things, and the application of that knowledge to the cure of souls." And the topics to be treated group themselves round three main centres, viz.: Instruction, Administration and Discipline. Each of these is very fully treated and very valuable advice is given. Thus under the head of Instruction, are four divisions. "The Pastor Catechising; The Pastor preparing for Confirmation; The Pastor Preaching; The Pastor in Social Instruction;" with very full subdivisions. Part II, with like minuteness treats of "Administration," in regard to "The Sacraments;" "Cases of religious experience;" "Sunday-schools;" "Direction of Activities" and "Parochial Administration." While Part III, tells of "The Pastor exercising Discipline" and "The Pastor a Gentleman." We commend this last to the consideration of the clergy in general. An admirable scheme and index, gives a full synopsis of the whole book, and enables the reader to turn at once to any particular subject. We have been specially struck with the chapter on Catechising; it is very suggestive. Every theological student ought to have a copy of this exceedingly useful book; and no clergyman, however mature, but would be benefited by its perusal. We thank the Bishop of Ohio for giving it to the Church.

A SYSTEM OF MORAL SCIENCE. *By Laurens P. Hickok, D.D., LL.D. Revised with the co-operation of Julius H. Seelye, D.D., LL.D., President of Amherst College.* BOSTON: GINN & HEATH, 1880. pp. 288.

Hickok's Moral Science was published some twenty-five years ago, and has been widely used as a text-book in our colleges. In issuing the present edition, the opportunity has been taken to revise the work, "making some additions to it, transposition of some parts, and giving to others a clearer mode of expression." This has been done especially in the part relating to the State and its authority; and also on Domestic Slavery. We are unable to say how great are the alterations, not having by us an old edition to compare with this; but should, from this concluding sentence of the preface, suppose them to be "considerable;" "thus with a different book there is not a different system of Moral Science." So far as we have been able to examine this work it appears to be based on sound principles, referring all morality to the will of God.

GUINEA GOLD, OR THE GREAT BARRIER REEF. *By Charles H. Eden.* NEW YORK: POTT, YOUNG & Co. pp. 160.

THE FRONTIER FORT, OR STIRRING TIMES IN THE NORTHWEST TERRITORY OF BRITISH AMERICA. *By W. H. G. Kingston.* NEW YORK: POTT, YOUNG & Co. pp. 160.

Two more of the excellent publications of the "Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge." Full of adventure, and yet with a decided though not obtrusive religious feeling pervading them, they are just the books to give to boys. We wish some of our publishers would reprint these and kindred children's books in cheap form, and so drive out those pernicious, immoral, sensational books which are doing so much harm among the young. We believe it would pay. These would sell just as well, and do good instead of harm.

PAT. A STORY FOR BOYS AND GIRLS. *By Stella Austin.* LONDON: J. MASTERS & Co. NEW YORK: POTT, YOUNG & Co. pp. 259.

A story of children living in London. An officer in the army dying, left a widow and eight small children. They come to live in an old but roomy house in "Hoppetty Square;" and this book records their sayings and doings. A set of healthy rollicking boys and girls. Seven of them call themselves "the army children." The youngest, Robin, born after the father's death, shows less fondness for military matters, and him they dub "only

the civilian." Pat, after whom the book is named, is one of those impulsive boys, meaning right, but ever doing wrong, but with such a loving heart and pleasant manner, that it is hard to keep angry with him. Altogether the book is a capital one and any boy or girl would be glad to have it for a gift.

THE FELMERES. A Novel by S. B. Elliott. NEW YORK : D. APPLETON & Co. pp. 357.

One of the saddest books we have read in a long time, yet so interesting that once taken up you are compelled to go through it. Miss Elliott has shown great power in description of natural scenery as well as in delineation of character. The story is a strange one; and Helen, the heroine, certainly very different from the ordinary novel young lady. She has been brought up in solitude by her father, a confirmed sceptic, in utter unbelief in any God, or any hereafter. Love for this father is her sole creed. On his death-bed the father makes her vow that she never will believe; so that if by chance there should be an hereafter they may not be separated. She marries, without love, a cousin, as a family arrangement. On her father's death she comes to the city to live, where she is brought into contact with nominal Christians, whose inconsistencies harden her in her unbelief. A child is born to her, and the pathos of the story turns on her love for this child, and the vital question, shall he be brought up a Christian, which she is made to feel, from her own misery, would be for his happiness in this world. But, if so, will he not learn to look upon his mother as lost? There are passages of great beauty and force; nowhere have we seen the utter desolation of unbelief more touchingly portrayed. Through all our sympathies are enlisted on behalf of the unbeliever, yet without shaking our own faith.

HARPER'S MAGAZINE for March contains an article, "A Winter Idyl," the illustrations of which are of great beauty. Indeed, all the periodicals of this house during the last month have illustrations which are very tantalizing to the lovers of Winter sports; such beautiful pictures of skating and sleighing, when we have had no ice or snow, are unkind to boys and girls.

STUDIES ON THE BAPTISMAL QUESTION; Including a Review of Dr. Dale's "Inquiry into the usage of Baptizo." By Rev. David B. Ford. BOSTON : H. A. YOUNG & Co. NEW YORK : WARD & DRUMMOND. pp. 416.

THE REIGN OF GOD NOT "THE REIGN OF LAW." By Thomas Scott Bacon. BALTIMORE : TURNBULL BROTHERS.

We have had these books on hand for some time, but have not yet been able to give them the attention their importance demands. We hope to be able to do so before long.